

CA1  
XC2  
- 1955  
B65

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Government  
Publications

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament  
1955

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

# BROADCASTING

*Chairman: Dr. PIERRE GAUTHIER*

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 11

THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1955  
FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1955

WITNESSES:

- A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Mr. John A. Dochstader, Assistant to the President, and Mr. Harold G. Young, General Manager, Toll Area, of the Bell Telephone Company.
- Mr. Walter M. Murdoch, Executive Officer for Canada of the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.  
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
OTTAWA, 1955.



SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING

*Chairman:* Dr. Pierre Gauthier

*Vice-Chairman:* Mr. G. D. Weaver

and

Messrs.

Balcer	Gauthier ( <i>Nickel Belt</i> )	Knight
Beaudry	Goode	McCann
Boisvert	Hamilton ( <i>Notre-Dame-</i>	Monteith
Bryson	<i>de-Grace</i> )	Reinke
Carter	Hansell	Richard ( <i>Ottawa East</i> )
Cauchon	Henry	Richardson
Decore	Holowach	Robichaud
Dinsdale	Kirk ( <i>Shelburne-</i>	Studer
Fleming	<i>Yarmouth-Clare</i> )	

R. J. Gratrix,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*

CFH  
XC 2  
— 1955  
B65

ORDER OF REFERENCE


WEDNESDAY, May 25, 1955.

*Ordered*,—That the name of Mr. Hamilton (*Notre-Dame-de-Grace*) be substituted for that of Mr. Diefenbaker on the said Committee.

*Attest.*

LEON J. RAYMOND,  
*Clerk of the House.*





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115257610>



## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Room 118,  
THURSDAY, May 26, 1955.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. this day. Dr. Pierre Gauthier, Chairman, presided.

*Members present:* Messrs. Carter, Fleming, Goode, Hamilton (*Notre-Dame-de-Grace*), Henry, Holowach, Knight, Reinke, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Richardson, Robichaud, Weaver.

*In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:* Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, G. Young, Director, Station Relations, E. Schnobb, Assistant Treasurer, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, J. A. Albert, Assistant to Secretary.

*From the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters:* Mr. J. T. Allard, Executive Vice-President.

*From the Department of Transport:* Mr. F. K. Foster, Broadcasting regulations Inspector.

Mr. Dunton recalled, made a statement on the brief presented by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters and was questioned thereon.

Mr. Ouimet answered questions specifically referred to him.

At 12.50 o'clock p.m., the examination of the witness still continuing, the Committee adjourned to meet again at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day.

### AFTERNOON SITTING

Room 118,  
THURSDAY, May 26, 1955.

The Committee resumed at 3.30 o'clock p.m. Dr. Pierre Gauthier, Chairman, presided.

*Members present:* Messrs. Boisvert, Bryson, Carter, Cauchon, Fleming, Holowach, Knight, McCann, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Richardson, Robichaud, Weaver.

*In attendance: From the Bell Telephone Company:* Mr. John A. Dochstader, Assistant to the President and Mr. Harold G. Young, General Manager, Toll Area.

*From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:* Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, G. Young, Director, Station Relations, E. Schnobb, Assistant Treasurer, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, J. A. Albert, Assistant to Secretary.

*From the Department of Transport:* Mr. F. K. Foster, Broadcasting Regulations Inspector.



Mr. Dochstader was called, introduced Mr. Young and retired.

Mr. Young was called, and made a statement on the principles of microwave radio relay transmission and outlined the major problems involved in engineering a Radio Relay System.

The witness described the Bell Radio Relay System that links Buffalo, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec City, and presented an outline of the coast-to-coast network now being built by the seven major Canadian Telephone organizations which form the Trans-Canada Telephone System.

The witness also reviewed the capacity of the system which is being installed to convey television programmes as well as telephone circuits.

Mr. Young made use of slides in explanation of the technical aspects of his presentation, and used a miniature microwave system to illustrate some of the properties of the microwaves.

The Hon. Dr. McCann, Minister of National Revenue, expressed to the witness the appreciation of the Committee for a very interesting demonstration.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned to meet again at 11.00 o'clock a.m. Friday, May 27, 1955.

Room 118,

FRIDAY, May 27, 1955.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. this day. Dr. Pierre Gauthier, Chairman, presided.

*Members present:* Messrs. Boisvert, Carter, Dinsdale, Fleming, Goode, Hamilton (*Notre-Dame-de-Grace*), Henry, Holowach, McCann, Reinke, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Richardson, Robichaud, Studer, Weaver.

*In attendance:* From the American Federation of the Musicians of the United States and Canada: Mr. Walter M. Murdoch, Executive Officer for Canada, Mr. J. W. McMaster, Q.C., Federation Counsel, and Mr. M. Norman Harris, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 149, all of the City of Toronto; Mr. A. Saunders, President and Mr. James Lytle, Secretary, Local 180, of the City of Ottawa; Mr. A. Fipaldi, President, and Mr. E. Charette, Secretary, Local 406, of the City of Montreal.

*From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:* Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, Charles Jennings, Director of Programmes, G. R. Young, Director, Station Relations, P. A. Meggs, Assistant to Director, Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors.

*From the Department of Transport:* Mr. F. K. Foster, Broadcasting Regulations Inspector.

Mr. Murdoch called, read a brief and was examined thereon.

The witness tabled the following document:

American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada Application Blank.

*Ordered,*—That the said document be printed as an Appendix to this day's evidence. (*See Appendix "A"*).

At 1.00 o'clock p.m. the examination of the witness being concluded, he was retired, and the Committee adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

R. J. Gratrix,

Clerk of the Committee.



## EVIDENCE

May 26, 1955.  
11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum.

Mr. GOODE: On a question of privilege, in the *Vancouver Sun* of May 24 the parliamentary correspondent in describing the deliberations of this committee had this to say: "Tom Goode, Liberal, of Burnaby-Richmond who has led the attack against C.B.C. in the committee . . ." I just want my position explained. I am not leading an attack on the C.B.C. as such. I have a regard for their executives and a regard for what they are trying to do. If my limited ability can be described as an attack, it is an attack upon the regulatory powers of the C.B.C. and I intend to continue that attack until the government does something about it. Thank you.

Mr. FLEMING: I was going to say that I think it is only fair to Mr. Goode and to all members of the committee to state that in all parts of the committee there is the friendliest feeling towards the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and towards its officials. The relations that this committee has always had with the C.B.C. have been of the happiest and the most harmonious. We, in this committee, or some of us, have had occasion to take strong exception to government policy in regard to many aspects of radio broadcasting and television broadcasting, but as to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its officials I think it is only fair to say for all of us that there is the friendliest feeling and the greatest appreciation of the devotion that its officials show to their tasks. We do not always approve of the policy that the government sets for the C.B.C., but that has nothing to do with the corporation as such, and certainly not with its very competent officials.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what I think, Mr. Fleming, and in my first appearance on TV I said that the members of the committee were all polite, charitable and fair.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman, as this is a morning of confession, and I am a suspect character, perhaps I might add a word. The same thing goes for the private stations. I have the greatest regard for the private stations and the people who run them and what they are doing, but I am a supporter of C.B.C. first—perhaps I may put it in that way in all these questions. Surely no one would have thought there was anything personal or anything of that sort in this matter, and I assume you think that there is not, so I would add to Mr. Fleming's remarks that the same thing goes in regard to the private stations and their officials. After all, we may have honest differences of opinion in regard to policy and that sort of thing, but that has nothing to do with any personal attitude.

The CHAIRMAN: If I may be permitted to say so, I absolve everyone.

Mr. KNIGHT: Now we are all in the clear, so may we proceed with the business?

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunton told me when he came in that he was ready to make a few observations on the CARTB brief this morning. I do not know



whether it will be agreeable to the committee that he does so this morning or whether you want to go on with the report on finance, continue and finish that report, and then he can bring forward his observations on the CARTB brief.

Mr. FLEMING: I was going to suggest that we want first to hear Mr. Dunton's observations on that brief. Last Thursday we seemed to get turned aside a little bit in the course of the afternoon's meeting. We had been dealing with the financial statement of the corporation, and I have some questions that I wanted to ask in regard to finance. However, if the committee strongly feels that they want to turn aside from that to take up Mr. Dunton's observations then let us do so.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is agreeable to the committee that Mr. Dunton makes his observations on the brief of the association now, he is ready to do so.

Mr. REINKE: While it is fresh in our minds.

The CHAIRMAN: If you have some questions to put to Mr. Dunton you can do so afterwards.

Mr. KNIGHT: I agree with the idea of Mr. Dunton's. It is my misfortune and it is only a personal reason that I have to be away tomorrow, and I would like to hear from Mr. Dunton today.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the committee agree to that?

Agreed.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have only some quite brief comments to make. The first is with regard to the reference to the Massey Commission and the statement by the chairman of the Massey Commission at the Canadian Club as quoted in the association's brief. I have read the statement of the chairman of the commission, with which I am familiar, and also the Massey report, and my reading must be different from other people's because I can find that it has no bearing at all on this question which is being discussed of whether or not there should be two or more stations in any area. If I might very quickly refer the committee to page 302 of the royal commission's report, and continuing on page 303, it says towards the bottom of page 302:

We do not propose to make detailed recommendations on the policy of development which it is the duty of the board of governors with its special knowledge and experience to determine. We understand that the board is proceeding with the plans laid down in the interim policy announced in March, 1949, and that coverage will be extended as rapidly as possible both through the C.B.C.'s own transmitting stations and by kinescope recordings provided to private stations which may come into being and serve as national outlets.

Later in the recommendations, recommendation "c" is:

That no private television broadcasting stations be licensed until the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has available national television programs and that all private stations be required to serve as outlets for national programs.

The committee will remember the situation at the time of the report: the C.B.C. had been authorized to establish production centres in Montreal and Toronto with stations, and that was all. I think, following the issuing of the report, there was some misunderstanding arising from some news reports which seemed to suggest that the committee was recommending there be no licensing at all of private stations until the C.B.C. had a network across the country. Of course, in the recommendation I have just read that was clearly not stated by the commission, and, as I read it, the chairman of the commission at the Canadian Club was simply reiterating what the commission had said.



If you read the passage as quoted in the brief of the C.A.B. it simply refers to the general question of whether any private station should be licensed any place in the country, and they thought that should be possible when the C.B.C. had national program service available, and there is no reference to duplicating stations at all. I do not think it is very important but I just wanted to mention that.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. Well, Mr. Dunton, without interrupting your remarks, before you go on to something else I would like to say that the remarks of the chairman of the Massey Commission were made subsequent to the writing of the report. That is quite clear?—A. Yes.

Q. And the subject from which the extract is quoted by him in Montreal on June 11 will have to be construed according to its patent meaning. I mean we are not questioning that these remarks were made by the chairman?—A. Not in the slightest.

Q. You are offering a rather different interpretation of them; that is all, from the one that was placed upon them in the evidence on Tuesday?—A. Yes.

Q. I suppose in a case like that we will simply have to look at those remarks ourselves and draw our own conclusions as to which is the correct translation.—A. That is all I suggest you do, read the English words and make your own interpretation.

Mr. GOODE: I do not wish to get away from Mr. Dunton's point, but I think perhaps in connection with what he said he should also include the remarks of the Minister of National Revenue in the House on Monday, March 30, 1953, when his interpretation of the situation was this:

The principle of one station to an area is to apply only until an adequate national television system is developed.

The point is: have we a national system now, which is the point that he was talking about? I expect that your views on that would be entirely different from mine, but if you will read what he says in the brief I think it is quite clear as to the intention of the government in this matter.

The WITNESS: I am not the person to interpret the intention of the government.

Mr. FLEMING: I suppose in that connection reference should also be made to the remarks of the Prime Minister in the House a week ago this afternoon. However, Mr. Dunton, that is not your function at all.

The CHAIRMAN: What did the Prime Minister say?

Mr. FLEMING: I am referring to his remarks in the House last Thursday afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: About what?

Mr. FLEMING: In reply to questions put to him, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: About the commission?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes, about the so-called single service coverage policy.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: As to how long it was to be applied.

Mr. KNIGHT: I think the statement was read into the record? Did not you read it in, Mr. Fleming?

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. No, I do not think it was read in. Reference was made to it, and I think the substance of the statement was commented upon in our meeting a week



ago this afternoon. However, Mr. Dunton, I do not suppose we are here to ask you questions about matters bearing on policy by way of justification or otherwise. You are concerned simply with the application of the policy as you understand it. I take it that is as far as you are purporting to go before this committee at any time in the realm of policy?—A. That is right.

Q. It is hardly the function of the C.B.C. either to defend or attack government policy in relation either to sound broadcasting or television, and I do not think anybody expects you to do either.—A. I agree.

The CHAIRMAN: I have your question here and the answer of the Prime Minister, if you want me to put it on the record.

Mr. FLEMING: Yes, if you have the text there.

The CHAIRMAN: May 19, 1955:

Mr. DONALD M. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): May I ask the Prime Minister a second question? Is the government contemplating either the abandonment or modification of the so-called policy of single station coverage with respect to television, that is to say the policy of local monopoly of television in Canada?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Prime Minister): The question is not one to which a categorical yes or no can be given. The policy has never been that there would be, for all time, only one station in each locality. The whole matter is under constant consideration, and the question as to when it will be deemed proper to declare that applications for duplication of service will be entertained is part of that consideration. It may very well be that no decision would be arrived at before the appointment of the commission to which the hon. member referred in his previous question.

Mr. KNIGHT: I do not think that there is any contradiction in that statement—any contradiction of what was in the Massey report or what Mr. Dunton has said. I notice that the phrase that the Prime Minister used was “for all time,” and for all time is a long time, is it not? The Prime Minister has another favourite expression, when he says “at this time,” which he did not use on this occasion.

The WITNESS: If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, there is a good deal of discussion in the brief, and I think there was before the committee, about the merits in general terms of competition and monopoly and that sort of thing. I would simply like to remind the committee of something which I think it is very well aware of, and that is that television, in the phrase of the Massey Commission, is akin to monopoly. The words I would use are that it is a monopolistic kind of activity, a monopolistic type of operation, in any case, because of the limitation of channels. In a practical way, let us look at the situation in Canada. Of the private stations licensed or whose licence has been recommended, there are 11 whose monopoly position, to use that phrase which I myself do not usually use, is set for as long as can be foreseen, because there are not any other channels available. Actually all the C.B.C. facilities, except in Ottawa, are not in the same position and technically there are other channels available for stations in the same areas.

It happens, as I say, from the way the channels work and can be distributed that already 11 of the private operations are in what looks like monopoly positions in VHF television for as long as can be foreseen. Around about four and a half million people live in the areas covered or to be covered by those stations.

I simply bring this up as perhaps illustrating what to me is a vital factor in considering any question of broadcasting and particularly of television broadcasting: in its essence it is a monopoly matter. Where possible, and it is



only possible in some cases, the authorities may decide to divide the monopoly, where that is possible, into two or three, but to my way of thinking it is still very much a monopoly. If, as I think there will be, a number of people wish to have a television station in Toronto—a number of different people—one only can get it, and he is in a monopoly position of being the only private television station in that area. He and the C.B.C. between them will share the monopoly of television in that area. As far as all the others who want a station in that area are concerned, there is very much a monopoly position.

It seemed to me that in all broadcasting, in all countries, the public through its proper authorities and means of decision, has to decide how it wishes these monopoly positions to be used in the best public interest, and I suggest that in Canada also different factors have to be taken into account in deciding these things: the public interest and the various aspects of it, economic factors and practical possibilities. Of course there can be differences of opinion about whether a monopoly should be divided into two partial monopolies or three at times. An illustration is the many long hearings I have sat through on our own board of governors listening to competent licence holders of broadcasting stations explaining why it would hurt their service to the public if there were another station in the area. I think it is interesting, and for amusement I had a check-back which showed that in the last three years over 80 per cent of the applications for broadcasting stations in areas served by other stations had been opposed by one or more existing stations.

It is an exception before our board when an application for an area already well served is not opposed by one or more existing stations. In some cases the board has thought the arguments of the existing stations were well founded. In some cases in recent years it has recommended favourably on the new applications, taking into account the development of broadcasting, the economic possibilities of the area and what the board can estimate about the economic position of those who are opposing the application. Naturally a board like ours will probably not take too seriously in some cases the arguments of a responsible man with all his facts and figures who says that if another station comes into his area his expenditures will go up and his revenues will go down, and he will not be able to render the same service to the public as he is doing now, or he will not be able to carry out plans for service to the public which he has in the future. As I say, we have thought those arguments well founded in some instances. In other cases where we thought the organization making those remarks had a large income, an excessive income, then we thought that there would be room and that it was a very sensible thing to have another station.

In connection with this question of duplication of television stations in any centres in Canada factors which are not too dissimilar arise. We have not the decision to make; we do not fight, as Mr. Fleming would say, for one policy or another. We have tried to point out to this committee the economic effects which we think this would have on the national system. It is for others to make a decision about whether those arguments are right or whether those effects should be accepted in the interests of allowing duplication. I think probably what we say and have said is influenced by the fact that we naturally are having constantly to look at what we see is the very big, the enormous problem, of financing the Canadian television system with its public and private components through the years ahead, producing at least a reasonable amount of Canadian programming and distributing service as widely and equitably as possible across this very big country.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. You are saying in effect, Mr. Dunton, that the necessity of finding substantial revenues to sustain the operations of C.B.C. in providing the national



service, the network service, leads the board in considering applications to weigh their claims to a licence against the necessity of preserving these revenues to the C.B.C.—A. I did not say that at all. I was talking about the arguments put up by different private interests.

Q. But in your concluding remarks you were saying just about that. I thought I was paraphrasing your closing remarks of your statement.—A. No, I do not think it is quite an exact paraphrase. I was saying that what we had said to this committee in answer to questions was explaining our view of the economic pressures resulting from duplication on the whole national system, which, if you want to put it that way, naturally affect the thinking of our board and ourselves.

Q. Well, you were speaking about the considerations, among others, that you weigh in reviewing applications that are referred to you by the Department of Transport. Am I correctly interpreting it?—A. Yes. In the first part of it I was talking about sound broadcasting applications. What I was referring to was economic arguments put up by private applicants or private operators at the present time.

Q. I was dealing specifically with your closing remarks in your statement.—A. On television?

Q. Yes.—A. Quite naturally I think it is our duty under the Act to think of the whole system and structure of broadcasting across the country, the national system in its broadest sense, with its public and private components.

Q. I hope we are not at cross-purposes. As I understood your statement, and it was in accord with what I understood the facts to be, when you, as the body to whom applications have to be referred, review the arguments for and against any particular application, you do weigh as one of the considerations the necessity of preserving the revenues required to operate the national service, the network service, of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I presume that would apply in both the field of television and that of sound.—A. But in television that has not arisen, because we have not received—

Q. Not yet. We will confine it then to sound. I presume it will arise with regard to television the moment you start receiving applications for transmitting stations in areas now served exclusively by the C.B.C.—A. I cannot say what will be in the minds of the board at the time, but after all, as I think you will agree, that is a major policy decision by the licensing authorities, as to whether they will accept applications and in general be prepared to license duplicate stations. In sound broadcasting I actually cannot remember that kind of consideration coming in, because the economics of sound broadcasting, complicated as they are, are a good deal more simple than in television.

Q. With regard to this matter of monopoly I suppose the considerations that you talk about where you have objections taken by those who are going to be immediately affected by the licensing of new applicants, the same sort of thing arises as you have in any field in which the government licenses people, or where the numbers of those who may participate are limited in some form by government action or legislation. We have the same thing in every province in connection with applications for licences to operate trucks or buses on the highways. It is a daily experience that the people who are in the field are naturally going to put their cases forward before the licensing body.—A. I think I was just pointing out that there are a great many differences of opinion there.

Q. Quite, but to come back, you are relating this I take it to the monopolistic position, because in the area covered by the signal on any one frequency naturally you cannot be licensing a whole lot of people who are going to interfere with one another on the one hand in the area served. That



is what, as I understand it, has been the position you have always taken with regard to what you have called the monopolistic aspect of radio broadcasting.—A. It is an essential part of broadcasting. A channel does not exist in a usable form unless it has that protection.

Q. There is nothing new in the considerations put forward in that respect now?—A. Except that it is a basic one that is very often forgotten in discussions on broadcasting.

*By Mr. Richard (Ottawa East):*

Q. Mr. Dunton, I think you explained that in the case of Ottawa there are two television channels available for Ottawa, and those two will be taken?—A. Yes.

Q. In Toronto there would be only one channel available?—A. There are two available in Toronto. One is being used by the C.B.C.

Q. So there would be only one available?—A. Yes.

Q. And if a private station got that one, that would be a private monopoly for that district?—A. Yes.

Q. What about Montreal? What is available there?—A. I think it is either four or five; I am not sure. Montreal is in a somewhat easier position than Toronto because there are not the other heavily populated areas close by in the States and around in Canada.

Q. May we have the figures for the various areas of the channels that the governors reserve for the C.B.C.?—A. Yes. I would like to give you some of the others too.

Q. Yes, if you will?—A. To take Vancouver, I think we have had that before. Shall I give you the total figures in each case? Three in Vancouver; Winnipeg four—again that is a fairly isolated area with not any other population centres around it.

Q. Edmonton?—A. Edmonton? Calgary has four and Edmonton four.

Q. Winnipeg?—A. Winnipeg four.

Q. And Toronto?—A. In Ontario, Toronto two.

Q. Ottawa?—A. Ottawa two.

Q. Is there another possible one for Ottawa?—A. No, not under the plan. Then as regards the whole area west of Toronto, that is Hamilton, London, Windsor and Kitchener, there is a new station in the Wingham area which will be serving the northwest part of southern Ontario, and Barrie; those are all single channel areas. Kingston is a single channel area. Peterboro is a single channel area. Montreal is four. Sherbrooke, where there is a station going in which will cover half a million people, is a single channel area. Quebec is three. New Brunswick, Saint John is two. Moncton is one, Halifax is three and Newfoundland, St. John's is three.

Q. I thought you said we could switch a channel from somewhere else to Ottawa?—A. No, I did not say that.

Q. There might be one available or one might be made available for Ottawa?—A. I do not think I said that. As I think the committee is aware, as Mr. Brown explained, it has been possible at times to make some adjustment, and it was only through an adjustment that any channel at all was made available for Peterboro, Kitchener or the Kingston area. I think it is conceivable that there might be some adjustments, from looking at the plan, but I could not see it would be possible to make more channels available west of Toronto, for instance.

Q. But in Toronto itself you could not have more than one other station?—A. That is right.



*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. I think you must have regard to the fact that is already well known to the committee both from your previous evidence and that of Mr. Brown when you say there are two channels available in Toronto, there were originally three, and in the period when applications were not received from private applicants, one of the channels was assigned elsewhere, and CBLT is occupying the other.—A. And I think to complete it further one of the shifts referred to made possible the channel for the Kitchener area, the shift which took a channel away from Toronto, otherwise there was no channel in the Kitchener area.

Q. Well, we have had the evidence before us about the way this went by way of Hamilton to Kitchener but I just wanted to bring that out to complete the answer.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. I understand that a station in Quebec is privately owned by Famous Players?—A. Famous Players have 50 per cent of the ownership.

Q. Did you receive any request to put a French-speaking station, a C.B.C. French-speaking station, in Quebec?—A. We had a number of private representations, yes, representations from private individuals or organizations.

Q. I raise this question because I received a letter this morning stating that the public is complaining that the percentage of English programs on this station is approaching 45 to 50 per cent and the English-speaking population is about 5 per cent. That is a private letter I received and of course I do not know if it is accurate.—A. I do not know; we have not checked the figures lately, but that station is an affiliate of our French network. Our full French network service is available to it. In addition sponsors and the station have asked for some English programs. We have supplied only a fairly limited number. What it is doing on its own programming I do not know at the moment.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. You will remember the questions that I asked the gentleman from Regina when I questioned him on the extent of his contract powers, if that is the right word, in regard to the private station in Regina, where he said that he had a licence I think for five years with no guarantee of replacement of that licence. Added to the remarks in the House of Commons on the date that I have mentioned before, March 30, was the statement that the C.B.C. may establish stations in some areas originally covered by private station. I do not entirely see your point where you talk about private monopoly. I can only go upon the evidence as placed before this committee, and, as you will remember,—I think you were in the room at the time—the gentleman from Regina intimated that there was no protection in a private station licence. It only goes to prove, I think, that point which the minister in the House mentioned, and it could be considered as a veiled threat that there is a likelihood that C.B.C. may in the foreseeable future go into a territory that is now this private monopoly. I readily agree you are right on that at the moment.—A. I think there is a misunderstanding about that. As I read the government statement of policy about the licensing policy as it is presently applied, it is completely clear when it says no two stations shall be licensed in any area, and that covers the C.B.C. just as well as private stations. We understand it perfectly clearly, and I think it is clearly stated by the government: under the present policy the C.B.C. will not be licensed in an area where there is a private station already, nor will two private stations be licensed in any area, nor will a private station be licensed where there



is a C.B.C. station. Then I think if you read what Dr. McCann is saying here in regard to what you were referring to, I think, he is saying: "... it may not be long before there is sufficient degree of national coverage to justify the government and the C.B.C. giving consideration to permitting two and perhaps in some cases more than two stations in certain areas. It is anticipated that, in due course, private stations will be permitted in areas covered by C.B.C. stations, and the C.B.C. may establish stations in some areas originally covered by private stations." In other words, he is saying that in the future the two might happen at the same time, but under the present policy neither can happen.

Q. But that policy is not being followed, because it is not true of the Toronto area, where you are allowing two stations in there now?—A. The Hamilton area?

Q. In the Toronto area.—A. It is not "B" service from the Hamilton area.

Q. But we have evidence before this committee that two stations are being received in the Toronto area.—A. I said it is not the "B" service. It can be heard, as our station can be heard, in Hamilton, but it is not, under the contour plan; as we understand what is meant by "B" service in Toronto.

Q. There is no argument about the fact that the policy of one station in an area is not being carried out. I do not think you will argue that this policy is being carried out in Toronto.—A. I think it is being carried out, as was explained by responsible officials, with some overlapping. In other words, they are trying to apply it in a fair and commonsense way.

Q. In one place you call it overlapping and in another place you call it monopoly. That is the difference between your point of view and mine.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. Is that correct?—A. As I read the statement of the situation.

Q. I was referring to the remarks just made by Mr. Goode. Speaking for myself there would seem to be some difference of opinion between Mr. Dunton and Mr. Goode. What is the correct statement of fact?—A. I put it in this way: there is a station in the Toronto area and a station in the Hamilton area, and there is some overlapping of the outer coverage; some Toronto coverage goes into Hamilton, and under certain conditions the Hamilton station can be heard in Toronto, but under the policy explained by the officials of the Department of Transport there is not too much overlapping. If it had been said that even that amount of overlapping would not be accepted then it would not be possible to have a station in the Hamilton area at all.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. Let us talk about this overlapping. My information is that 3,000 television sets in the Toronto area—and I do not maintain it is all over Toronto because I do not know too much about it—can receive the Hamilton station. Would you agree with that?—A. I do not know. I think there are about 280,000 sets in the Toronto area.

Q. Would my figures be correct, or do you know?—A. I do not know. I do know that a survey shows that there is some listening to Hamilton in Toronto, but it is only a small amount.

Q. It is a pretty big overlap, is it not, if 3,000 sets, meaning perhaps 12,000 people in Toronto—and I am going a little below my information in order to try and be on the correct side—can hear a station outside. Can we call it an overlap?—A. Well, 3,000 sets, of course, is not a large percentage.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: It is 1 per cent.



Mr. REINKE: I think the record yesterday or Tuesday would show us how many people in Hamilton are listening. I think it was 9,000.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. There are a lot of people in Vancouver who do not listen to CBUT and they are missing something. I have said in this committee that I think you have the best programs on the air in Vancouver, but nevertheless there are other alternate services available, not from Canada. In Toronto that is not true.—A. But, Mr. Goode, I think this should be applied in a commonsense way.

Q. Do you mean to say I am not talking common sense?—A. I was not suggesting that, no.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure Mr. Dunton is not suggesting that.

The WITNESS: I think it would be perfectly possible that if a station were established in Victoria there might be on the outer edges of the coverage some overlapping.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. I quite agree.—A. I take it you would not object to that.

Q. I would be most happy for them to have a station in Victoria that we could hear, and then I believe that we would be on the same plane as the Toronto area, and I submit that Vancouver is just as much entitled to it.—A. I would guess it is perfectly possible that it might happen.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): My suggestion is that some people on the outskirts of Toronto are almost as close to Hamilton as they are to the centre of Toronto.

*By Mr. Robichaud:*

Q. Would this contour map that is asked for settle this problem?—A. If I might just comment on that, as I think the Department of Transport officials explained, those are engineering calculations. We all know in television, and many listeners know, that in many cases you get reception beyond those contours. In some cases reception even at the edges of the contours is not too good.

*By Mr. Henry:*

Q. Mr. Dunton, speaking of television channels, I understand that there is a VHF and a UHF group. Is there any other group of channels?—A. That is all we know of so far that have been allocated in the States or contemplated for allocation in Canada. I think the radio spectrum in general is getting pretty crowded.

Q. It is. Taking into consideration the two groups, what is the potential of the Toronto area in terms of the number of channels?—A. There are some UHF channels allocated there too; there are two UHF channels.

Q. What is the international body that distributes these channels in each of the two groups?—A. It is a national body in each case, the Department of Transport here and the Federal Communications Commission in the States, and there is an international agreement between the countries on the use of television channels in areas near the border.

Q. So that the distribution of these channels for the Toronto area is a matter of agreement between the United States and Canada—A. Yes.

Q. Have the two countries in reserve any further channels in either of these two groups which possibly could be distributed in the Toronto area?—A. It would be my guess that there is not anything in reserve. The competent



people to say would be the Department of Transport, as I have said. We, as laymen, looking at the plan and knowing their problem cannot see where they could get any more channels.

Q. Do I understand that for all time, having in mind present knowledge as to this matter, we are limited, as you have said, to this number of channels for the Toronto area?—A. It would appear so, but I think that nobody would say that there might not at some time be technical developments or that there might not be some changes which would make something possible. What I said is from what we know now, and as far as we can foresee that seems to be the situation.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. Do you not mean by that last answer that it is the limit in the Toronto area now, since the other channel originally intended for that area was shifted in the manner referred to earlier this morning?—A. That is the limit, and I would make my usual addition to that, that that shift made possible VHF service in another area which did not have it.

Q. But so far as the Toronto area is concerned, about which Mr. Henry is talking, there were originally the three channels assigned?—A. Yes.

Q. The question was raised earlier about this overlapping, and I have looked up the evidence given on the Elliott Haynes' survey on this matter. It may not be the complete answer, I agree, but this was the evidence given on Tuesday about that matter, if I may refer to it. Mr. Allard in quoting the figures of the Elliott Haynes' survey was dealing with what he called total circulation, and so far as York county is concerned, the county in which Toronto is located, the CBLT Toronto circulation was 791,528, and CHCH-TV Hamilton 76,954. Then Wentworth county, in which Hamilton is located, showed the circulation of station CHCH-TV Hamilton as 112,207, and CBLT Toronto 65,454. I suppose the figures of Halton county are partly of interest, seeing that it lies between the two. CBLT Toronto circulation 18,671, and CHCH-TV Hamilton 18,671. I wonder if that is quite right, because it shows the same figure for both. I wonder if perhaps there is a reporting mistake in that figure, Mr. Chairman. They would hardly be exactly the same. I am referring to the original flimsy, Mr. Chairman. It may have been corrected.

The CHAIRMAN: The clerk tells me that Mr. Allard has read the copy, that is to say the information you have there, and he did not notice the mistake if there was a mistake in it.

Mr. FLEMING: It just struck me in reading this over now that it would be a great coincidence if the figures were exactly the same.

The CHAIRMAN: That can happen.

Mr. FLEMING: For the two stations in Halton county. However, those were the figures that were given to us the other day in regard to circulation.

*By Mr. Henry:*

Q. I was wondering, in regard to the city centres across Canada, about the relative number of radio stations as compared to the relative number of available TV channels. Are they just about equal, Mr. Dunton? Take the Toronto area as an example. You would have four there. There were originally five and now there are a possible four channels as I see it.—A. You are including UHF?

Q. Yes.—A. UHF, as you know, and as I think has been explained to the committee, has many difficulties.

Q. At the moment it is not commercially possible?—A. It has a great many difficulties. In Toronto there are about six—two C.B.C. and four private stations.



Q. Then it looks as if in Canada there will be a lesser number of available channels than there are existing radio wave lengths now?—A. Thinking very quickly I would say yes.

Q. Did you ever make a rough approximation as to where this is going to lead? Would there be, let us say, two-thirds the number of channels in relation to the number of radio stations that we may have?—A. I have not made that investigation. I think one would have to look over the list of channels and the number of stations in different places. In some places if you add UHF and VHF together there would be probably more channels than existing stations, but UHF at the moment does not look very practicable in Canada.

Q. I understand there are some adjustments or there is some instrument which could be attached to the average set which would make the UHF group of channels more usable.—A. Yes, adapters can be put on sets. Mr. Ouimet can explain it to you if you like. However there has been a lot of trouble with those adapters.

Mr. OUMET: Adapters of any kind whether for FM or UHF have not proved very popular because they are additional equipment which has to be added to the set. Generally adapters have not received public support.

Mr. HENRY: Why do the manufacturers not put them in, as a selling point for example? Would it add to the cost of the set too much?

Mr. OUMET: Well there is a difference between the set designed to receive UHF and a VHF set which you later fit with an adapter. I was answering your point with regard to the adapters. It is perfectly feasible to make sets which will receive both VHF and UHF, and many sets which are made today will do just that. They are more expensive but they can be made easily and they have been sold. However there is another problem apart from the receiver and that is that a UHF station has a more limited range because it uses much higher frequencies and you have to use relatively much higher power to get the same coverage. As a matter of fact, to get exactly the same coverage as for a VHF station you need powers which are not practicable; in other words you have to use millions of watts instead of thousands of watts. The whole question of the economics of UHF broadcasting is one which is in an experimental stage in the United States, a number of UHF stations have had to close down, and the outcome of the experiment is still not certain in any way.

Mr. HENRY: Is there any analogy between the early days of radio and the present state of affairs in television for use on the UHF channels? In other words did we have wave lengths in the early days of radio which were commercially non-profitable and technically non-desirable?

Mr. OUMET: I would not say that there was anything similar to this. You have perhaps a similarity as between FM and AM radio and UHF and VHF-TV. FM also was an experiment and it has not worked out too well, although technically it could be done, but the question of economics came in, and economics are the big problem for UHF. Nobody can say with any certainty whether UHF will eventually be used on a large scale. It may or it may not, but at the present and for some years to come it does seem that it has a definite disadvantage as compared with VHF.

Mr. HENRY: Thank you.

Mr. WEAVER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to sound broadcasting for a moment to present to the C.B.C. officials a partial or a possible solution of some of their problems in the fringe or sparsely populated areas. To give some of the background, as you know, Canada consists of a long strip of heavily populated area running east and west, and as you work



north it thins out, although it goes for many, many miles north. The Precambrian Shield runs northwest, and the further west you go the further you go into less populated areas. There are roughly three sections of the country that fall into this category. One has been mentioned already, in the Northwest Territories, where the C.B.C. officials have said that they are actively considering solutions there. The eastern area is roughly Newfoundland and northern Quebec, and I do not think the problem is quite as serious there as it is in mid-central Canada, which is roughly northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan. When you go north of Manitoba the population is very, very sparse, so that that could hardly be considered at the present time. In the Northwest Territories there are approximately 27,000 people. In northern Manitoba, in this area that I speak of, there are approximately 50,000 people, and taking in northern Saskatchewan it would be about two and a half times the numbers spoken of in the Yukon Territory. There is a station CFAR at the present time at Flin Flon in Manitoba. I have been told that a satellite station could be put up at a place called Gillam on the Hudson Bay Railway, at a rough capital cost of \$25,000 and a monthly maintenance cost of about \$400. I have also been told that the same thing would apply at a place called Lac de Brochet. These are two centrally located points in that area that would practically cover all those people. There are many problems and I am just presenting this for the consideration of the officials. I realize that in order to get the C.B.C. programs over these areas you would have the problem of C.B.C. station and private station programmes going over satellite stations, and the question would be: who did the station belong to? Those are things that could be gone into later. But the thing is that the C.B.C. programmes could go through CFAR, be picked up by these satellite stations and broadcast to cover most of that mid-central area, at a relatively low cost.

I think it might involve an increase in the power of CFAR, but I think that that is a difficulty that could be taken care of. It might involve a direct wire from C.B.C. to CFAR. These things are in the realm of possibility. It might take a change of policy or it might not, but if the officials would give that their serious consideration I feel that the mid-central Canada section of the sparsely populated areas could be taken care of at a reasonable cost, and I would be very grateful if the officials would take that into consideration.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, we will be glad to look into the possibilities both technical and financial.

Mr. FLEMING: May I turn now to the financial statement?

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. Before going to the financial statement I wonder if Mr. Fleming would allow me to ask a question. I have two telegrams here covering the situation in East and West Kootenay in British Columbia. I am informed that the two Spokane television stations have erected either one or more masts in East and West Kootenay and are now piping television programs to private houses from the State of Washington. I understand the field extends from Kimberley and Cranbrooke into the area of Trail and Rossland. These two telegrams only cover Trail and Rossland but there is a number included here of 950 television sets or householders who are now using the service. I expect that the total, including Kimberley and Cranbrook would be something like 1,500. What the Spokane stations are doing is to charge the householder something like \$115 for the original installation and \$4 a month for the service. I wonder, does the C.B.C. or the Department of Transport give the Spokane stations a licence to do this? May I explain that the people who are actually doing the piping are a firm of McLellan, McFeeley and Prior Limited a large wholesale

hardware house in British Columbia. The service is already in operation, I am informed. I have never seen it but I am told by these telegrams that the service is now available to the householders in this part of the country. What do we do about a licence for an installation of that kind?—A. That is a Department of Transport matter.

Q. It has nothing to do with you?—A. It is not ours. I think Mr. Brown mentioned that they were just setting the conditions of licences for such things, conditions and rules.

Q. Could you tell me if licences are issued or do these people just go ahead? Does the Spokane station go ahead and provide a service without getting a licence?—A. I am not sure of the situation at the moment. I know there is a provision in the Department of Transport regulations for private commercial receiving stations which would cover this sort of operation.

Q. I would have to check with them?—A. Yes.

Mr. GOODE: May I be allowed please for Mr. Dunton's information to put this letter on the record. I have just received it. It is from my colleague Mr. Fairey, the member of parliament for Victoria, and he addresses to me. He says:

"It is my understanding that a TV channel is allotted to Vancouver Island.

In the event that a private licence to operate a TV station on Vancouver Island is considered, I request that you recommend to the committee that the claims of Victoria, the capital city of British Columbia, be fully considered before the allocation is finally decided."

I thank you for allowing me to put that on the record.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you hand in that letter?

Mr. GOODE: Yes.

*By Mr. Knight:*

Q. I think that maybe we should not go into the financial position until we have had a word or two more about this brief which we have had presented to us over the last day or two. I take it that our concern here as members of parliament must be the public interest. It is still my opinion that some support for the C.B.C. as it is presently operating is in the public interest. I want to ask Mr. Dunton this question: if the requests of the private organizations as outlined in this brief, as presented in the last day or two by Mr. Allard, were granted, is it Mr. Dunton's opinion that it would be detrimental to the C.B.C. in its present functions?—A. With regard to the suggestion of allowing duplication of stations where it is possible, I think, as we have tried to explain before to the committee, that at the present time it would have an adverse effect on the general support for the whole system, the whole national system, trying to produce and distribute programs to public and private stations. I do not think it would be completely disastrous, but it would have an adverse effect making the financing and support particularly from advertisers for Canadian programming more difficult. With regard to the suggestion of a separate regulating body, which is an old and much discussed problem, my best answer is to refer the committee to the Massey report again, and particularly to pages 283 to 286, where they give there their views after their very long study of the matter.

Q. We had the suggestion put forward I think by Mr. Allard, and by somebody else, that there was growing opposition to C.B.C. policy across Canada, and that certain suspicions were being created in the public mind of the C.B.C. as an adjudicator. As Mr. Allard stated, rightly or wrongly, as a competitor of the C.B.C., there was a growing suspicion in the public mind that C.B.C. would



not in certain circumstances do justice to private citizens. Now I suggest that this suspicion, of which I have heard nothing among my own constituents or in my own province, as a matter of fact, because I think my own province is fairly solidly in support, from what I can gather, of the C.B.C.'s present actions and policies—some of this suspicion might be caused by lobbies of various kinds by people who were perhaps not so concerned with the public interest as they were with certain private interest. I wanted to ask Mr. Dunton if there is in fact a definite lobbying in his opinion being carried on against C.B.C. policy and to what extent? What is the extent of that lobbying?

Mr. FLEMING: Is that a fair question to ask Mr. Dunton? What does he know about it?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunton will judge the fairness of it.

Mr. FLEMING: Is the lobby applied to the C.B.C. or to parliament?

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): It is the same question that was asked of Mr. Allard.

The CHAIRMAN: Was that the question which was asked of Mr. Allard the other day?

Mr. GOODE: The only unfair part of it is this: I think it is an interesting question, but I do not think it is C.B.C. policy. If there has been a lobby, it is on government policy. I think the C.B.C. policy in this matter is non-existent; it is given by the government of Canada to the C.B.C. to carry out. I wonder if Mr. Knight would change his question.

Mr. FLEMING: Was Mr. Knight talking about a lobby applied to the C.B.C.'s board of governors, or one applied to members of parliament. I quite understand Mr. Dunton having within his knowledge the information with which to answer the first question, if that is it, but not to answer the second one. It may be within our knowledge, but not within his.

The CHAIRMAN: Members of parliament could answer it.

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Dunton is a man of discretion and I think he might be allowed to answer a question in his own way and use his own discretion.

Mr. FLEMING: You are surely not going to allow Mr. Dunton to put himself in the position of answering your question as to whether or not any lobby is exercised upon members of parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you please put your question again, Mr. Knight?

Mr. KNIGHT: It would be a lot of trouble. Mr. Dunton understands it, and so does the committee.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): Let me put it this way: is he aware of a growing suspicion—the suspicion which Mr. Knight mentioned amongst the public against the C.B.C., and its actions, as a Board of governors?

The WITNESS: I think I would try to answer both at the same time. I do not know anything about lobbying. I think it has been obvious to anybody who follows the public prints and expressions of opinion that there has been promotion of opinions and views mostly about the broadcasting legislation. I have not seen much recently which looks as if it was directed towards C.B.C. activities itself.

Mr. KNIGHT: Perhaps we could get it from another direction. Are there protests? I think this question is fair: are the protests against the things I have been talking about, which Mr. Dunton receives in his public capacity as head of this institution—are they coming mostly from bona fide members of the public who are interested in television and radio, to the same extent as they are coming from, shall we say, private interests or people who have

interests financial or otherwise to serve? Would that be a fair question? I mean: is the brunt of the propaganda against the C.B.C. originating in the minds of the public or with other people who have interests—and quite legitimately—of their own to serve?

The WITNESS: I cannot answer the question in that form. I can only repeat that I think it is obviously—where there is nothing said or done in Canada—that there has been a promoted effort to spread opinions—certain opinions—particularly about broadcasting legislation and about questions of our regulatory power and so on; but naturally not much of that comes to us directly. If it does, we explain that we do not write the laws and so on, and that we try to carry out our job as set by parliament.

Mr. FLEMING: I think Mr. Dunton is going outside his sphere, and I want to take exception.

The CHAIRMAN: What do you mean?

Mr. KNIGHT: It is a point of privilege.

Mr. FLEMING: This concerns the proper sphere of Mr. Dunton's testimony in line with what I said earlier about what is the proper sphere of questioning Mr. Dunton in regard to this matter. He said in the latter part of his last answer that this is a matter which comes to a very slight extent before the board of governors because they are not the people who write the policy; but in the first part of his answer he undertook to make a statement of some general import. Now, Mr. Dunton is here to answer questions on matters which come within the policy and experience of the C.B.C., but not to make statements of a general nature which obviously have nothing to do with the discharge of his duties as chairman of the Board of Governors of the C.B.C.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the answer exactly the way you gave it, to see if Mr. Fleming is correct?

Mr. FLEMING: Why not let the answer be read back by the reporter? Mr. Dunton undertook in the second part of his answer to make a general statement in regard to what is going on in the country, and to say that it comes only slightly to his knowledge and to the C.B.C. because that is outside the sphere of the C.B.C.'s board of governors. The opinion of anyone could be taken on that basis as to what is going on in the country in the way of the formation of opinion.

Mr. KNIGHT: It seems stupid, so far as I am concerned. This is a sort of hemming and hawing, and getting around the edge of things. What we are here to find out is the ultimate truth; and so far as I am concerned that is what we want to get in this committee. But we are harried around here with regulations and personalities and that sort of thing. That is why I was a bit outspoken yesterday. We "fooled" around with this thing and I finally asked a definite question and you took objection to it.

Mr. FLEMING: They are not proper questions to put to this witness.

Mr. KNIGHT: I put questions of the same sort to Mr. Allard yesterday.

Mr. FLEMING: As I understand a lobby, it is something which is applied to members of parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: This question has been decided. The second part of Mr. Knight's question was dropped.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Knight still wants an answer to his question.

The CHAIRMAN: He did not mention the word lobby in his last question.

Mr. FLEMING: He has not received an answer yet and he wants it. He will keep at it until he gets it. He has been coming close to asking Mr. Dunton for his opinions in his question, and I submit that Mr. Dunton is over-stepping his proper sphere in his testimony, as chairman of the board of governors.



The CHAIRMAN: Do you want the reporter to read back the answer which Mr. Dunton gave?

Mr. KNIGHT: If I have learned anything in persistence, I have learned it from my hon. friend.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): Some of us have ears too; Mr. Dunton did say that he was not in a position to answer about lobbies; but that personally he was aware—just as it has appeared publicly—that there are certain promotions going on in the country in the past few years. Everybody knows that. I will take the witness-stand myself if you want me to do it, or you can do it yourself. There has been promotion published in the past few years against the C.B.C. legislation particularly in regard to the institution of an independent board. That is what he said. And he also said “but I have nothing to do with the legislation”.

Mr. FLEMING: I would like to know what Mr. Richard means by “promotion”?

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): Publicity and articles.

Mr. FLEMING: This is a free country.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): Everybody knows about it.

Mr. FLEMING: There is a great deal to do about something that is purely the right of free men in a free country to express. It has been discussed in the House of Commons. I take issue with the term “lobby”.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): Nobody said it was a lobby.

Mr. FLEMING: Oh yes.

Mr. KNIGHT: I do not care if I never get an answer. In his opposition to having the witness answer the question, Mr. Fleming has gone quite far enough in my mind.

Mr. CARTER: Mr. Allard made a statement in his testimony that there was a growing suspicion. I am a member of parliament and I have not found any suspicion in my district, or encountered any in any of the provinces in which I have moved about. I think what Mr. Knight was trying to get was this: that there may be pressure groups which are putting on pressure and becoming vocal in impressing the idea that there should be a separate regulatory body, and in justifying it on the basis that there is widespread suspicion of the way in which the C.B.C. handles, or makes recommendations about applications for private stations. I think that is the trouble, the basis on which they put forward this pressure I think is wrong because I do not believe there is any widespread suspicion anywhere in Canada.

Mr. KNIGHT: If these assertions are true, then I claim that the witness at present before us has the right to say whether or not they are true, and whether in a borderline case where the C.B.C. has to make a decision of that sort, whether it has committed the injustices which it has been asserted are being made, and of which we are told there is a growing suspicion throughout this country, to which I object, and which I do not believe. I think that Mr. Dunton is perfectly competent to answer that question.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Notre-Dame-de-Grace*): I think perhaps this works in reverse as well. The C.B.C. has spent almost one-half million dollars—\$483,000 on press and information. I think it can be proven without very much difficulty, using your own words, that a portion of this money is spent to present the C.B.C.'s point of view.

The WITNESS: It is not spent to promote the C.B.C.'s point of view on radio legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Notre-Dame-de-Grace*): On page twenty-nine of your annual report, you say:

Provision of information about radio and television programs and C.B.C. operations generally is the responsibility of the Press and Information Division. The work of this division falls generally into the categories of general information, press services and publications.

In the field of general information, P. & I. personnel deal directly with requests from the general public for information on a wide range of subjects. Requests for information on specific subjects from press sources are also handled.

I would imagine that the C.B.C. would object strenuously to any suggestion that this money was being spent to present their views on the legislative position of the C.B.C. or on anything which properly falls within the field of the government. Mr. Dunton just drew that to our attention; but I daresay that almost any corporation in Canada—and certainly one which is in the public eye such as the C.B.C.—would be delighted to have one-half million dollars to use for press and information services of whatever nature, shall we say.

The WITNESS: What is that?

Mr. HAMILTON (*Notre-Dame-de-Grace*): For press and information services of whatever nature.

The WITNESS: If you had been on the committee earlier you would have heard us explain how the money was spent. It was not spent in putting forth any views on what parliament said our job was to be.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Notre-Dame-de-Grace*): I am not suggesting that. We were discussing the presentation of a certain point of view, and I thought that I might remind the committee that the C.B.C. was spending almost \$500,000 on press and information service to comment on C.B.C. operations generally.

Mr. GOODE: I think the remarks of Mr. Hamilton would have been qualified if he had been sitting in this committee for sometime. I have put up the argument here, not against the C.B.C., but against the policy. But if Mr. Hamilton would perhaps read the transcript for the last few weeks he would find out that the C.B.C., on questioning from both sides, has quite readily submitted to this committee a reasonable excuse for the large expenditure. Let me put it that way; and I am quite satisfied that not one nickel of that money has been spent to promote their claims or their regulations. But when we are talking about suspicion, I think that "suspicion" is a most unfortunate word. I think there is disagreement in the country in regard to whether the C.B.C. should be the judging body; and when they start to talk about a so-called lobby, I have a newspaper clipping from one of the Vancouver newspapers which expresses Mr. Laing's views. Mr. Laing is the Liberal leader in British Columbia and he is quoted as having taken issue with the federal government policy, and to have called for private television licenses in all parts of Canada.

I do not go all the way down the line with Mr. Laing because I do not agree that private stations should be licensed in all parts of Canada. I think they should be licensed in urban centres. Mr. Laing has only five or six members in that House and he would not be in a position to conduct a lobby.

The public feeling in British Columbia, as I have tried to point out in a very small way, is displeased with the government policy that the C.B.C. should be the final judge and jury on the matter of licenses. I still disagree with that, but as far as suspicion in regard to the officials of the C.B.C. is concerned, there is no thought in my mind of that at all.



Mr. KNIGHT: I want to reserve my place because I have a couple of minor questions to ask which have no relation to this particular thing. But I do want to make my position clear: that if by its very nature radio and television are a monopoly, and if they have to be a monopoly, then it has to be either a public or a private monopoly; and if it has to be one of those monopolies, my preference is that it should be a public monopoly which would be responsible to the representatives of the people of Canada in parliament.

Secondly, I think that the policy and action of the C.B.C. at the moment is in the public interest. Perhaps that may change in the future; and if any of these suspicions about which we were told exist in the public mind, then I want the public to know where and by whom that particular suspicion is engendered. That was the purpose of my whole questioning. I want the public to know that this suspicion is not a thing which has arisen simply spontaneously, but that it is to some extent at least the result of what I choose to call a lobby, but which another person may call something else. I presume there is a difference in the meanings of the word, but I thought my meaning was perfectly clear in its language.

Mr. GOODE: As far as your statement is concerned, you are just expressing the C.C.F. policy of a government monopoly in regard to television and radio.

Mr. KNIGHT: I expressed what has been the Liberal policy over the years in that regard. But why bring it up?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think we should continue on that ground.

Mr. KNIGHT: No. As far as the C.C.F. party is concerned, I am a member of it, and I am proud of it.

Mr. FLEMING: May we ask Mr. Dunton a question about monopoly?

Mr. KNIGHT: I want to keep on going for a moment or two, because I have to go down and make a broadcast over a private station. However, Mr. Dunton, I asked Mr. Allard about private stations yesterday, and about logs. Mr. Allard told me that he had no responsibility to provide logs to this committee. I suggest he had no responsibility to provide anything to this committee except his own opinions which he did quite freely.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not get the last part of Mr. Knight's observation.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Knight is undertaking to make a statement of Mr. Allard's evidence. It is not correct. Mr. Allard said that he did not get the logs of the station; he said it was the C.B.C. which got the logs of the station, whenever they chose to ask for them.

The CHAIRMAN: That was his answer.

Mr. KNIGHT: I am quite sure that the private stations have logs of their own affairs.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Allard was there on behalf of the organization. He does not operate any private station. We must be fair to Mr. Allard in the evidence which he gave.

Q. Let me ask this question: you have the logs in your possession?—A. Yes.

Q. I wonder if they are available to the committee?—A. They are very bulky things. We get them every week from all across the country. It is a great volume of material.

Q. It would be hardly reasonable then to ask you to produce them; but I am interested in the proportion of time given by stations to sustaining programmes on the one hand, and to commercial programs on the other. What is the proportion, roughly speaking?—A. We have not done a survey. It is not an easy thing to do, because you get a great many programmes in which there are spot announcements, but whether they are commercial or non-commercial, it would require quite a long job to ascertain. It will be pretty difficult.

Q. I take it that there is some obligation on the part of private stations to give a proportion of their time to sustaining programmes.—A. Not particularly. We naturally watch the operation of programming since we have an obligation to make recommendations upon the renewal of licences and that sort of thing. We do keep an eye on the amount of commercial messages and spot announcements which are covered by regulations, but we agree with most private stations that the quality of the program itself is more important, whether it is sponsored or not. We do not say that when a station does give a local programme which becomes sponsored, that it necessarily casts any pall on the programme at all. We are more interested in the programme itself. We are much more interested in the general service they do; in the various aspects of it, in the amount of live programming of any kind, in the amount of community service which they do with live talent in relation to the practical possibilities of their area.

Q. I understand from my own observation of some of the private stations that they are giving a very excellent service to the public in the matter of affairs of a local nature, and sustaining programmes. Is there any widespread gap between them in that regard?—A. Yes. I think with Mr. Allard that there is a lot of variation in the amount of what is generally called community service, and in the quality of it; I believe that there had been a lot of very good work done around the country.

Q. We have a private station in our own community, CFQC, which has made a very good record in that regard.—A. We know them, and they have done a lot of very good work. There was a question of about how much live programming is being done by private stations across the country. Taking a sample week in January of this year, and averaging the programming of all the stations right across the country, it is about twenty-one per cent in live broadcasts.

Q. Perhaps I should mention the other station, CKOM, as well. They are very much a rival station.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. What is the percentage of live programming of the C.B.C.?—A. The entire network?

Q. Yes. You mentioned the private stations as averaging twenty-one per cent right across the country. What would the C.B.C. average be right across the country?—A. You can see that in the annual report, where we gave a breakdown of the various programmes.

Q. You put a percentage on the record with regard to the private stations. What is that percentage for the C.B.C.?

Mr. FLEMING: For the over-all?

The WITNESS: Yes.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. Yes, exactly on the same basis?—A. This was for January. It would not be on the same basis on the C.B.C. because in sound broadcasting we are to a large extent operating networks and providing network programmes.

Q. I would like to have a figure on exactly the same basis as the twenty-one per cent figure for the private stations.—A. We could get that for you on the network service.

Q. I want it on the same basis as you based your twenty-one per cent, right across the country.—A. We cannot do it for individual stations.



Q. Then how did you base that twenty-one per cent?—A. By taking a breakdown of what each private station was doing and averaging it.

Q. Could you not do the same thing for me as far as the C.B.C. is concerned, and let us have it at some time?—A. For our network service?

Q. Yes, yes.—A. Yes, sir.

*By Mr. Knight:*

Q. Getting back to my question: is the time element a correct measure of the public service that a station is rendering? There are times at which these programmes come on. There are certain times which may be better than other times. Consequently there are some broadcasts which are much more profitable than others; spot broadcasts, for example, are some of the most profitable sources of income for a station. There must be many other considerations as well as the actual time during which the station is engaged in broadcasting, in order to measure the public service of that station.—A. Very much so. We think that the volume of time is a quite imperfect measure. When we study what a station is doing, we look not only at the volume of time allotted to the different types of things. We ask them to tell us what they are doing in this or that period, and we agree with the stations very much that they may be putting much more effort, and being much more useful to the community in a half an hour with a particularly concentrated programme, than in two or three hours of much more ordinary programming; and the question of the useful time is related to the size of the general audience at different times of the day. Now in the daytime in many cases you have as big an audience as at any time at night.

Q. I have one more question and then I shall have finished. We know there are C.B.C. regulations which allow the various scripts which are used in the C.B.C. programmes to be obtained by members of the public who write in.—A. There is no such regulation.

Q. It is simply a courtesy?—A. It would be a courtesy by the station.

Q. If there is no such regulation in regard to the C.B.C. then neither is there such a regulation in regard to private stations?—A. No.

Q. Suppose I wrote in and asked—let us say it is one of our own local stations—for the script of a certain programme. If they gave it to me, it would be a matter of courtesy, and they are not under an obligation to do so?—A. That is right.

Q. When a speech has been made over a C.B.C. station I take it that there is a regulation that the script of that speech should be left with the station?—A. Yes.

Q. For filing?—A. Yes.

Q. That is a definite regulation?—A. Yes.

Q. Do the private stations follow that same practice?—A. Yes, pretty well, I think. There is a general regulation that they should keep any material of that kind either on file or available, but not to the public.

Q. It is not necessarily produced on demand.—A. Not to the public, no.

MR. KNIGHT: Thank you very much.

*By Mr. Carter:*

Q. Following up Mr. Knight, private stations are required to carry a minimum of 5½ hours of C.B.C. programmes?—A. I think there is a misunderstanding about that. Originally when the service was starting, we said we would guarantee to private affiliates a minimum of ten and one half hours, and would expect them to carry a minimum of 10½ hours. But since then it has developed to the point where that 10½ hours has grown, to 30 and to 40; generally, usually 35 to 40 hours a week. There was not an accurate explanation of that 10½ hours the other day.

Q. When you make that time available to the private stations are there any conditions attached? Do you require them to space it at certain times of the day, or are they free to use it at any time they wish?—A. No; it should be used at the time it is on the network. If they are an interconnected station, it has to be used when it comes to them on the network. For scheduling reasons, or for sponsored demand, we usually ask the private stations receiving the service by recording in most cases, to programme it at certain times corresponding to the interconnecting network.

Q. When you say thirty hours, that includes sustaining as well as network programs?—A. We would have both sustaining and commercial programs, in other words, both commercial as well as non-commercial programs.

Q. Do you require the private stations to carry a minimum?—A. So far in television we have not come down to a system of rigid reserved time for programs. We have been working more by cooperative discussion with the stations, and, as we explained before, there have usually been more cases of the stations wanting more service, rather than forcing them to take more. But as the system develops we will probably get to the point with some of our non-commercial programs that we will have to insist on their being carried. Our affiliates are reasonable people and they know, for instance that we want the main, national television news covered, so most of them take it and are very glad to have it, as well as some of the other important programs. It has not yet in any way come to a question of forcing or not forcing. There are some programs which the stations have said they do not want to carry and we have not insisted that they do so.

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. I do not know if as a member of the committee I am too much interested in whether the so-called suspicion referred to by Mr. Allard last Tuesday is what I would call a legitimate suspicion, or one which might be referred to as an inspired suspicion. I am interested at the moment only in what are the facts. A person may be suspicious and yet may have no facts at all; or he may be suspicious and have his suspicions confirmed by the facts. I am prepared to believe Mr. Dunton, Mr. Chairman, but there is a question I would like to put to him through you, that might be termed as a serving answer. I am also very much confirmed in my view that he is intelligent and honest enough to give me the best answer he can. My question is very simple. In Mr. Dunton's experience have there been any great number—or any instance at all—of abuses or prejudices to private stations in respect of the advisory or regulatory authority which the C.B.C. has?—A. In my view there have been none in the decisions or the recommendations made by the Board of Governors in carrying out the duties given to it by parliament.

Mr. GOODE: You would not want to include the applications made to the Department of Transport. That is a different matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Now gentlemen, the figures quoted by Mr. Fleming during the course of this debate are, I am told by the Clerk, accurate figures—that is the figures he quoted from Mr. Allard's evidence of yesterday.

I might tell the committee that I made a mistake in forgetting to welcome a new member, Mr. Hamilton, and I hope he will excuse me for having forgotten.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Does he replace somebody?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Diefenbaker.

This afternoon we shall have representatives of the Bell Telephone Company here and I hope all members of the committee will attend. It will be most interesting.



## AFTERNOON SESSION

MAY 26, 1955.

3.30 P.M.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. As I told you previously, we have here two officials of the Bell Telephone Company, who are coming to add to our knowledge of the microwave radio relay system. Mr. Harold G. Young will be the principal speaker. He is the general manager of the company's toll area and is thus directly responsible for the system which, as you know, carries network television programs under contract with the C.B.C. Now I will call upon Mr. John A. Dochstader to introduce Mr. Young. Mr. Dochstader is in Ottawa as assistant to the president of the Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, will you let me say in recommendation of Mr. Young, that he comes from Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: That is so. That is in addition to his good reputation, Mr. Fleming.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Chairman, in spite of that we will be glad to hear him.

Mr. JOHN A. DOCHSTADER: (*Assistant to the President, Bell Telephone Company*): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, two years ago we inaugurated our radio relay system between Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto. This system carries long distance telephone messages and television programs at the same time. Also in 1953 we completed an international link between Buffalo and Toronto. The equipping and construction of this so-called core system, as well as the present radio relay development that we are undertaking in cooperation with the other six member companies of the Trans-Canada Telephone System, have been under the direction of Mr. Harold G. Young. Since early in 1953 Mr. Young, as the chairman said, has been general manager of our toll area, which is that part of our organization responsible for all the facilities and services from a long-distance standpoint. However, Mr. Young's association with radio relay goes back well beyond that date since when he was general manager of our western area (with headquarters in Toronto, Mr. Fleming) he guided most of our experimental work in radio relay. In this work I might say that Mr. Young is active not only as a telephone company executive but also as a radio enthusiast in his own right. I understand—and I will not divulge the year—that he was just fifteen when he first became actively interested in radio, and even now as a ham operator he has a station in his home in Montreal which operates under licence No. V.E. 2C.P. which was granted by the Department of Transport. It is exactly to the day forty-one years ago that Mr. Young was granted Com. Opr. Licence No. 38.

Mr. Young during 1917 and 1918 was a wireless operator with the Royal Canadian Navy, and in 1920 he graduated from the University of Toronto in electrical engineering. Since that he has had thirty-five years' service with our company, and during that time he has been closely associated with most of the major developments in the telecommunications field.

I have pleasure, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in presenting Mr. "Cy" Young, who comes before you today as a representative of the Trans-Canada Telephone System.

Mr. HAROLD G. YOUNG (*General Manager of Toll Area, Bell Telephone Company*): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I thank you very much, John for the introduction. It is a pleasure for me to come before you to deal with the radio relay system and its relation to television, and to try and give you some information about a very technical subject in a non-technical manner.

First of all I would like to say a few words about the Trans-Canada Telephone System so that you are clear as to what it is. Across Canada there are seven major telephone organizations. Starting from the east there is the Maritime Telegraph and Telephone Company Ltd. operating in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, a privately-owned company. In New Brunswick there is the New Brunswick Telephone Company Ltd., another privately-owned telephone company. In Ontario and Quebec the Bell Telephone Company of Canada; in Manitoba the Manitoba Telephone System, a creature of the provincial government. In Saskatchewan the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, and in Alberta the Alberta Government Telephones, both also provincial government organizations; and in British Columbia the British Columbia Telephone Company, a privately-owned company. These seven members make up the Trans-Canada Telephone System, and the Trans-Canada Telephone System is not a corporate entity: it is an association of these seven members who agree to provide the facilities to give a coordinated long-distance telephone service across Canada, and who undertake to provide the facilities in their own territories to inter-connect with the other systems. The association is governed by a committee elected by the members, and they do their business through that governing committee.

Now of course the revenues from toll messages are collected by each company and they are cleared through a clearing house, and the clearance is based on the mileage of the facilities furnished by each. The Bell Telephone Company, playing its part in this Trans-Canada Telephone System, have extensive long-distance facilities, of course, and I would say that the major backbone route of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada consists of buried cables from Windsor to Quebec. Across the rest of the country the backbone system is a pole line on which is wire, and superimposed on the wire are carrier systems.

Back in about 1949, in the section between Montreal and Toronto those buried cables had a capacity of some 500 telephone circuits, and in 1949 about 350 of them were in use. It was quite evident that we were going to have to do something to add to those facilities, and there were several ways of doing it: to lay another underground cable, and if we did that we had to follow the same routes, and it would be very desirable to have a separate route. If we required a separate route we would have to lay two cables from Montreal to Toronto. The third way was by radio, and radio of course got a tremendous boost during the second world war, where a lot was learned about radio in a very short time, and as to the cost that was indicated to reinforce the facilities between Montreal and Toronto, a single cable and a radio relay system were about a stand-off. Now, of course, the radio relay system gave you an alternate route so that the hazards were not common to the two routes, and at the same time the C.B.C. were interested in television circuits between Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto, and we were invited to tender for those facilities.

Of course your television transmission cannot be put over ordinary telephone cables, while it can be put over radio relay, so a combination of events decided that we would put in a radio relay system Montreal-Ottawa-Toronto: hence our real entry into radio relay.

As regards the situation across the rest of Canada, by and large with probably the exception of Calgary to Vancouver, a pole line and a fully loaded pole line, will supply about 100 telephone circuits, and we have about 100 circuits on that pole line in all sections except Calgary-Vancouver. Therefore the same situation holds right across Canada as held between Montreal and Toronto, that we had to do something to reinforce the telephone facilities.

Now again the C.B.C. are interested in television across Canada, and that fact weighed in the decision to build a radio relay system, the detail of which is on that map there if you care to examine it afterwards. I am going to give



you in the course of a short description some of the engineering considerations in designing a radio relay system, but first of all before I start that I would like to talk about frequencies just a little bit.

Now you are all familiar with 60 cycle lighting current and you are all pretty well familiar with audio frequencies in general. I might say that the piano is a good illustration of the frequencies involved. The bottom note on the piano is an A and it is 28 cycles per second. The top note is a C and it is 4,196 cycles per second. Those are the fundamental tones from the bottom to the top of the piano. The piano tuner uses one of these things (tuning fork) and he tunes A above middle C to a tuning fork which is 440 cycles per second. This is what 440 cycles sounds like (demonstrating). Now I think we should let you hear maybe 50 cycles just for a second, and 4,000, just to get an impression of the difference. May we have 50 cycles? If we cannot we will go right ahead.

Mr. FLEMING: I guess it is the government service which has broken down!

Mr. YOUNG: I would like you to get this. Well, we will skip listening to the voice sounds for the moment, but the audio and the voice range extends from some 20 cycles to 20,000 cycles per second.

Now over the telephone facilities we transmit a band of 3,000 cycles—from 200 to 3,200 roughly. We could transmit the full 20,000 cycles but your telephone service would be a lot more expensive, and 3,000 cycles is a perfectly adequate range of frequencies to give good telephone conversation where you can recognize the voice of the speaker, and it will carry all the voice inflections that are involved in understanding a telephone conversation.

As regards other forms of wave propagation: sound, of course we are all equipped with a transmitter. I am working mine here and you are hearing it, and you are hearing it through a pair of receivers which you have. As regards radio where the frequencies extend from 20,000 cycles per second well up into the megacycles, a person is not equipped with transmitters and receivers, but when you go a little higher and come to the frequency of light, for instance, we all have a pair of perfectly good receivers that are sensitive to frequencies of light.

Now television, a video circuit, requires a band of frequencies between 3 million and 4 million cycles in width, compared to a telephone circuit of 3,000 cycles, and on the same facilities that we can carry a television video picture we can put 600 telephone circuits. To a telephone engineer that suggests right off the bat that television is a very expensive form of communication. It does convey a tremendous amount of information, and maybe 600 telephone circuits is a fair measure of the complexity of the information which it carries. Actually, while it looks to us as a very expensive thing, it is a very small part of the cost of television. I happened to read just yesterday a review of the cost of a half-hour program across the line, which in over-all cost was \$56,000 for a half-hour. It went to 83 stations in the American network and the communications company which carried the network received \$1,000 for that half-hour program, slightly less than 2 per cent of the cost of producing the half-hour program.

Now I would like just to talk about radio frequencies for a moment, if I may have my first slide, and have these lights turned down a little bit. I am not going to bore you with this very much.

—(First slide)

This is an arbitrary division of the radio spectrum, and while the voice frequencies are entered at 20,000 cycles you will see the radio picks up at 30,000 and of course it goes all the way to 30,000 megacycles, 30,000 million, and even higher. The ordinary radio that you are familiar with, this AM

broadcasting, uses the frequencies from about 525 to 1,500 kilocycles, and as to the range of AM broadcasting you are also familiar with the fact that in the daytime you may hear an AM station a hundred miles away, for instance in Montreal you might hear Ottawa, but at night in Montreal you might hear even Los Angeles. The range is much greater at night. The reason of course is that these radio frequencies are reflected by the ionosphere, and the distance that the reflection takes place varies between day and night. It is reflected by a layer of the ionosphere which is ionized by the sun's rays. As you go down in frequencies the range of radio varies greatly. For instance at 7 million cycles per second here the range probably would be about 1,000 miles in the daytime and half-way around the earth at night. As a ham I have talked to Australians early in the morning on 7 megacycles many times. When you go a little bit higher in frequency, to 14 megacycles, which is another ham band, in the daytime the range, if there is an opening, may be half-way around the earth but at night it would be confined to line-of-sight; so the maximum-distance that you might get at night would be a line-of-sight, 30, 35 or 40 miles. That also holds with the rest of the higher frequencies, except that in the daytime the range is the same as at night.

These higher frequencies are not reflected by the ionosphere as are the lower frequencies, and therefore radio in these higher frequencies is confined to short distances and line-of-sight.

The frequency chosen by the Bell system, the telephone system, for their radio relay is 4,000 megacycles—4,000 million cycles per second—which is a common carrier band which is reserved for common carriers. Now there is television broadcasting in the lower band and in the higher band, there is FM and many other uses of radio. Where the frequency is very high and the wavelength is very short, perhaps I might just describe the relation between frequency and wavelength very briefly. All these radio frequencies travel at the speed of light, 186,000 miles per second, or 300 million metres per second. Let us take this 500 kilocycle one as a sample. In one second that energy will travel 300 million metres, and in the same second there are 500,000 cycles of that energy. During the space of one cycle that energy will travel 300 million metres divided by 500,000, or 600 metres, and the wavelength of that frequency is 600 metres or roughly 1,800 feet.

If you come down to take this mobile telephone band of 150 megacycles, the wavelength there is obviously 2 metres, 6 feet. When you come to 4,000 megacycles the wavelength is 3 inches. Now the first antenna that is a good radiator of radio energy or a good collector of it depending upon whether it is a receiving antenna or a transmitting antenna, is a wire half a wavelength long. If you wanted a really efficient antenna for AM broadcasting you would try and get a wire, taking this 600 metres or 1,800 feet, where half a wavelength would be 900 feet; but when you come down here where the wavelength is 3 inches the radiator would be an inch and a half long. Where the wavelength is short it becomes practical to introduce that radio energy at the focal point of a reflector or of a lens and to send it out as a beam of radio energy concentrated all in one direction, and concentrated in any direction which you wish, just as a searchlight concentrates light by introducing the light at the focal point of a lens and sending it out as a beam.

Now our radio relay system uses that very system of reflectors or lenses to concentrate the beam of energy in one direction and send it all in that direction, and, as a result, our radio relay system can use a power output of half a watt, whereas the ordinary power you think of in radio may be termed in kilowatts, and many kilowatts.

For our radio relay system, where you can beam it all in one direction, we actually use an output of half a watt.



—(Second slide)

There is just a small point here. Of course the bane of the radio engineer's existence is noise. He must design his system to have a signal that is well above the noise level. All man-made noises such as ignition systems and static from lightning and so forth is concentrated in low frequencies. Above 1,000 megacycles no really man-made noise exists, so that in the radio relay system which we use we have to concern ourselves with residual thermal noise from vacuum tubes and other parts of the circuit but not with static or man-made noises.

—(Third slide)

This will take but a few minutes to describe: designing a radio relay system to go from Buffalo to Toronto, which was one of our first problems and one of the most interesting ones that we had. This is the geography. The distance from Buffalo to Toronto is 58 miles air line, most of it across Lake Ontario. Buffalo is a little bit east and of course south. Now here is one alternate route, to go to Fonthill and to Toronto, with one repeater. Another alternate would be to go to Fonthill, to Milton, to Toronto, with two repeaters. That might suggest to you that this lake has some effect on radio, and I will show you why it does. At one time we thought we might have to go right around the end of the lake to get from Buffalo to Toronto satisfactorily.

—(Fourth slide)

Now, of course the first thing you do when you are designing a radio relay system is to examine maps and look for high points so that you can reach as far as possible with a clear line-of-sight. You must have a clear line-of-sight between the transmitting and receiving antennae. Now this is the profile of Toronto to Buffalo. In Buffalo the ground level is 600 feet above sea level, and in Toronto it is about 290 feet above sea level, the lake being 234 feet above sea level. The top of the New York Telephone Company building in Buffalo is 830 feet above sea level, and the top of our Adelaide-Elgin building is 500 feet above sea level. Obviously that would have to go through the Niagara escarpment, and the high point in between is the Niagara escarpment. In order to get a direct shot there would require 500-foot towers on both of those buildings, and obviously it is not a possible solution.

—(Fifth slide)

By examining the maps, Fonthill is right on the edge of the Niagara escarpment and it is 825 feet above sea level. Again in Toronto the top of the Canada Permanent building—and I will explain why we used the Canada Permanent building rather than our own building in a later slide—is 530 feet, so that you get clearance over the high spot, the high spot being Lake Ontario. We need more than just clearance for good transmission; as a matter of fact in that path we need 105 feet. If anybody is interested in optics it is the first fresnel zone clearance, and the first fresnel zone clearance is that distance which would make this route a half wavelength long rather than the direct one. A half wavelength here is an inch longer. In order to get that clearance we need 105 feet above Lake Ontario, to get first fresnel zone clearance. This is the path that we chose, and this is the bug that is in it. Drawn on here, as well as the direct path between transmitter and receiver, there is another path reflected off the lake to the receiver. The lake is a good reflector. So that you have, arriving at the receiver here in Toronto from this transmitter, two radio pieces of energy, and if they are in phase they would give you a stronger signal than if there were no reflected path. If they were out of phase, of course, they would subtract. If they would stay put they would not be very worrisome,

but they do not stay put, they vary in phase, and for that reason we have to use two frequencies across this path with a receiver on the end of each frequency and an automatic switch from one to the other. We have found from experience and we have operated this for at least two years, that this works very satisfactorily, and the Bell system have found that as long as the separation between radio frequencies is 40 megacycles they do not fade at the same time. Therefore we actually use a difference of 180 megacycles in the two frequencies. We have two transmitters and two receivers, and the one in use is automatically switched to the one with the good signal at the receiver in Toronto.

—(Sixth slide)

Now I am going to show you a few pictures of the testing equipment and I will describe how they are used. This is a picture of a test tower which can be put up in two or three hours to a height of 200 feet, and the antennae can be raised and lowered on it. That is the antenna and it has a parabolic reflector, and you can put it at any height you wish to test and see that you are getting clearance.

—(Seventh slide)

This is a picture of the transmitter and the parabolic reflector, and this is where the microwave radio energy is generated, and it is transmitted out into this parabolic reflector.

—(Eighth slide)

This is a close-up with Hugh Bishopric here helping me adjusting the wave-guide. The radio energy comes out of a rectangular wave-guide to the focal point of this reflector, is spilled back into the reflector and then goes out as a beam of radio energy.

—(Ninth slide)

This shows the receiving antennae we used for the tests, just sand-bagged down on the roof of the Canada Permanent building. The receiver looks like the transmitter; it is the same kind of a dish.

—(Tenth slide)

Now over in Fonthill we put in for the use of the C.B.C., before we had our permanent construction, a temporary set-up in which we used 80-foot poles, and it is just a little interesting to show a picture of that. Here is the reflector, a parabolic reflector towards Buffalo, and there are two on the side towards Toronto. We used that for about a year. The equipment is housed in this little building here, and of course we have to have this kind of a building for regular purposes.

—(Eleventh slide)

This is a picture taken from the top of our Adelaide-Elgin building in Toronto looking towards Fonthill. We wanted to use the top of our building, but in order to see Fonthill it was exactly through that slot. This is the Royal York Hotel on Front street and this is the *Daily Star* on King street, and the line-of-sight of Fonthill was through this slot between the Royal York and the *Daily Star*. That is why we moved over to the Canada Permanent building at the start, because from the Canada Permanent building you see Fonthill clear of the *Daily Star* building. When we first started up we actually used our building and we had trouble. I remember having Mr. Ouimet and some others there when we first started, and we really had trouble. This was the nature of the trouble that we had. The transmitter at Fonthill is of course sending



a beam of radio energy here which was coming through this slot into our antenna. It was also going up University avenue to the Hydro building, it was reflected off the Hydro building back onto the Royal York and again back into our antenna, so that we had two signals in our antennae on our building, one through the slot and one up to the Hydro building back to the Royal York and then up to our antennae. The signals varied too much and therefore we could not use that slot for radio transmission. What we did was to put a 150-foot tower on the Adelaide-Elgin building so that we got the signal up here.

—(Twelfth slide)

Now here is the geography of Montreal-Ottawa-Toronto, including the leg over to Buffalo. The first thing you do is to pick these points by looking at topographical maps, and once you have picked them you have to make sure that there are no obstructions in these paths. We do that using the test equipment and the test towers which I showed you to check the accuracy of the maps and to determine accurately the height of towers that we need at each point. This has twelve intermediate points which, by the way, are unattended, and three main points, Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal. At each of these spots one needs an access road, one needs power and one needs telephone facilities. The average length of these paths is 27 miles and the route mileage is 43 miles longer than the air mileage. The longest path of course is across Lake Ontario, 42 miles, and the second longest one is from Rigaud to Montreal, 33 miles. The two shortest ones are getting in and out of Ottawa, Ottawa being at the Ottawa river level, and being surrounded by rising land, we can only get short shots out of Ottawa, 15 miles to Leonard and 17 miles to Stanley Corners. The towers vary from 50 feet upwards, the highest ones being 212-foot towers, one at Enterprise and one at Westport. Of course those heights are a minimum, because these towers cost roughly \$300 a foot and you juggle your tower heights to get the best economic solution out of it.

Since we have built these, Peterboro, which is just north of Hastings and Bethany here, has been added, and Kingston, just south of Enterprise, has been added to the system.

—(Thirteenth slide)

Now another little thing that we have to watch out for in designing a radio relay system is to stagger the stations. They must not be in a straight line, because, for instance, here is a transmitter in Ottawa transmitting in that direction at a frequency of 3,770 megacycles; in the next section it has dropped to 3,730 and in the following it is back at 3,770. In this receiver we do not want any energy from this transmitter; we only want it from that one, so this receiver must be off this line far enough that it does not get energy from the one further on. Therefore all the way we must endeavour to avoid over-reach interference.

—(Fourteenth slide)

This is the Enterprise tower, a 212-foot tower, and you can see the antennae at the top. There is a platform up there to hold up the antennae. There are four antennae, one for receiving from each direction and one for transmitting in each direction. The equipment is located in a building at the base of the tower, and the transmission from the equipment to the antennae is by wave-guide up the tower. A wave-guide is merely a rectangular brass tube that is finished very smoothly on the inside.

—(Fifteenth slide)

This is the other 212-footer at Westport, and you can see the building.

—(Sixteenth slide)

Here is the Bethany site where there is a 50-foot tower with four antennae. These are lens antennae, and the equipment building.

—(Seventeenth slide)

This is the antenna for the mobile telephone system which covers the country around Peterboro, so that we can give you a telephone in your automobile if you want it and you can communicate with any other telephone in the Bell system. This would be the transmitter and receiver that would receive the signals from your car.

Just a word about towers. This beam of radio energy is a beam that only varies on degree from centre. Therefore these towers have to be very rigidly constructed so that they will not vary either way more than one degree. Consequently the footing at the corner of each tower has to be big enough to hold it down, not hold it up, but to hold it down so that the wind will not blow it, and it is designed to stand 120-mile an hour wind.

—(Eighteenth slide)

Just as a sample, at the Enterprise 212-foot tower this chunk of concrete which is the footing, is 12 feet square, 3 feet thick and buried 10 feet, so that there is enough weight of concrete and fill at each corner of that tower to hold that 212-foot tower down in a 120-mile an hour wind.

—(Nineteenth slide)

Here is a picture looking along Adelaide street towards the east at our Adelaide-Elgin building, and there is the 150-foot tower on top of the Adelaide-Elgin building.

—(Twentieth slide)

This is in Ottawa and the top of the O'Connor street building. Of course the design of this tower in Ottawa just had to be different to conform to appearance and so forth. Mayor Whitton and the committee for Ottawa came forward with that design of tower, and you can see it out here at O'Connor street. There are also the antennae. These are the ones that look towards Leonard and the other ones towards Stanley Corners.

—(Twenty-first slide)

This is the Montreal Terminal at the head of Shakespeare road or Remembrance road. We had to dress the building up a little bit there because of the location. That is a 75-foot tower and these two antennae look at Rigaud. Now of course we have extended this system on to Quebec, and also on this tower is an antenna towards Quebec and Rougemont mountain is the first point east towards Quebec.

—(Twenty-second slide)

Now I am just shortly going to describe what the Trans-Canada Telephone System has under way. The C.B.C. are authorized to enter into a contract with us covering television from Sidney to Vancouver. This system, of course, is what we have already built, Buffalo-Toronto-Montreal to Quebec, and this we are building. As regards the points that it is going to touch, there is one left out: Barrie, North Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie, Timmins, when they have a station, Fort William to Winnipeg. In general this follows the Trans-Canada highway and there is not one station on that route, and there are 36 of them, that is more than a mile away from the highway. This has all been path tested completely, and of course we build the section in Ontario and the Manitoba Telephone System builds from the boundary to



Winnipeg. We will maintain this system Toronto-Winnipeg from three points other than Winnipeg, from North Bay, from Kapuskasing and from Fort William, and those will be the only attended points on this system. Now we have an alarm system which we put in, and talking about Toronto-Montreal there are twelve unattended points between Toronto and Montreal. The alarms from those points come into Kingston. The man in Kingston can tell 42 things about these stations: he can tell when the door is opened; he can tell whether the temperature is too high or whether the temperature is too low; he can tell if the pressure on the wave-guide goes up or falls off, and he can also do ten things in each station. We have emergency power in each station, and he can start the emergency engine. It starts automatically, but in case it does not start he can start it from Kingston.

—(Twenty-third slide)

This is the western section from Winnipeg-Brandon-Regina-Moose Jaw-Saskatoon-Medicine Hat-Calgary-Edmonton-Lethbridge and Vancouver. The path testing of this section at the moment is done to Medicine Hat including Saskatoon. Edmonton to Calgary is done and they are presently working from Calgary to Medicine Hat, and they have this amount left to do.

—(Twenty-fourth slide)

This is the eastern section from Quebec to Sydney Mines; Quebec-Fredrickton-Saint John-Moncton-Sydney Mines and Halifax. Now, you will notice the dotted line on here. That dotted line is a radio relay system which is a part of the transatlantic cable. The transatlantic cable is going from Oban in Scotland to land at Clarendon in Newfoundland and at Sidney Mines, and the transatlantic cable circuits are extended by radio relay through to New York and to Montreal by our system. Now we get a ride on there for television by leasing from the E. T. and T. Company, the Eastern Telephone and Telegraph Company, a subsidiary of the A.T. and T. There are three owners of the transatlantic cable, the E.T. and T. representing the American Telephone and Telegraph, the C.O.T.C., the Canadian Overseas Telecommunications Corporation, and the British Post Office. We have shown it as E. T. and T., but there are really three owners of this and we are leasing television channels there and building these spurs. Now the path testing on this spur is finished and they are starting up here right now. That path testing will be all done this summer both in the east and we hope in the west. Of course in many sections of this country topographical maps were not accurate, and where we did not have accurate topographical maps we gathered all the pictures that had been taken by anybody, and where we could not find pictures we flew it and pictured it so that we could draw contour lines and determine the high points. Of course the path testing checks that and determines actually the height of towers which you have to build. On this system we are planning to instal two channels in each direction, two radio channels in each direction. We are going to put the television channel on one of them and in addition 120 telephone circuits on the same channel, and have the second one as a spare which can be switched in automatically if one fails. Therefore right across Canada that is the picture. The ultimate capacity of this radio relay system is six channels in each direction, five of which you can use, and the sixth can be used as a spare. That gives the capacity of this system. You can have five television circuits in each direction or you could have five groups of 600 telephone circuits, or you could have any combination of those. You might have one television channel in each direction and 2,400 telephone circuits.

That is the last slide, I think.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Young, you did not make any reference to Newfoundland, except just a passing reference there.

Mr. YOUNG: Well, I will be very pleased to tell you about Newfoundland. Newfoundland is a bit of a problem for television purposes. It is not an impossible problem. As a matter of fact the C.B.C. did inquire about the cost of television to Newfoundland and at the moment we were not prepared to say what the price was. We know how to do it but it is going to be quite expensive. I think that is about all I would like to say about Newfoundland. Now there are some interests in some communication systems in Newfoundland. A T.D-2 or an over-the-horizon radio relay system would be a fine alternative to the transatlantic cable from Newfoundland to the mainland and there the three owners of the transatlantic cable are interested. We are interested as an alternate for the Newfoundland telephone service and I am sure the C.B.C. are going to be interested from a television standpoint, and somehow in the future we will work out a mutually satisfactory scheme.

Now I am perfectly willing and prepared to take any questions you like to fire at me. I hope I have given you a sufficient description of what we have built. The detail of it is all in that map. There are 136 relay points from coast to coast. There are many things I could talk about in it. As regards the vacuum tube, which is the main transmitter, there is one on that board there all in pieces. It is a 416 triode with an output of half a watt and very close element spacings developed especially for this service. Of course you may be able to picture the maintenance of that system. Of the 136, well over 100 will be unattended stations, and our experience with Montreal-Toronto, as well as the Bell system's experience right across the United States, is that it is a very reliable system. I do not say that we do not have troubles; we do, but they are not serious.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: What would your capital costs run to from Sydney to Vancouver?

Mr. YOUNG: In the order of \$40 to \$50 million.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: That accounts for the high rates that we have to pay for rental.

Mr. YOUNG: I would not subscribe to the proposition that the rates are high. I think they are very reasonable.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: I will leave out "high" then.

Mr. YOUNG: All right. It really costs money. Now if there are any questions anybody would like to fire at me, technical or otherwise, I will do my best to answer them. If you do not have any questions I am going to give you a little demonstration of a radio system which I think you will find interesting.

Now we have a little demonstration equipment here. This equipment is the equipment which we used to give our maintenance people an understanding of how microwave behaves. In this little box is a transmitter, a radio transmitter on a frequency of 10,000 megacycles, and in this one is a receiver. The energy comes out of these little horns, which are designed just to direct it in this direction, so now perhaps we might have a little tone over it.

Mr. KNIGHT: The reporter will have a little difficulty with that one!

Mr. YOUNG: Now we are just modulating it with about 400 cycles. If these were two sites, let us say Westport and Enterprise, and there was a hill in there that was not supposed to be, and this piece of brass was the hill, that is what would happen. This is a piece of brass, a conductor, and of course a conductor is a good reflector of radio energy. Now this is a piece of dry wood, an insulator, and it does not have any effect, it does not reflect the radio energy and it does not have any effect, whereas my hand is a pretty fair conductor.



This is a plastic box and of course the plastic is an insulator, and the water in it is of course a conductor. The water of course reflects the energy and it does not get into the receiver. Therefore that illustrates clearly that we have to have a clear line-of-sight with no conductors anywhere in the way.

Now this is a screen. Those are just ordinary wires. All these radio systems have certain polarization. This is a vertically polarized radio system. You are all familiar with throwing a stone into a pond of water and you see the waves travel outwards from where the stone falls, and you get the drops of water merely going up and down. This radio energy is advancing like the waves on the water, of course at the speed of light, 186,000 miles per second, and the electrons in between here are merely vibrating back and forth. Now I will hold this thing so that they can vibrate across here, and they will still continue to vibrate, but if I hold it the other way up they will bump into these wires and they will not go. Now we can horizontally polarize this system by just turning these things over onto their side and now the electrons are going up and down. If I put it in this way it will obstruct them and if I put it in the other way they will still be able to go up and down.

Now here is a type of crude lens. It is thicker in the middle than it is at the outside and it tends to take any bits of radio energy that go through the outside and let them go through fast, and the ones in the centre are retarded. Again the slots have to be horizontal so that the electrons can move. I will demonstrate here how this crude lens does collect the radio energy here and direct it onto that receiver. I think you can see here that it does act as a lens and focus it on that spot. Of course if you have it this way up it would stop it, the same as the wires.

Now this is just a piece of solid plastic which is of a rectangular cross-section and is a very good wave-guide for both light and for radio energy. This flashlight does not have a great output, but perhaps we could have the lights turned down and I think you can see that that light does go around the corner and come out at the end of that, so that while light travels in a straight line, when you put it in a wave-guide you can make it go any shape you like. It is also a very good wave-guide for radio energy, and we can demonstrate that. It takes it around that corner beautifully.

Just to illustrate the fact that this is a very good reflector of radio energy, a conductor, I can demonstrate it in this way. We can do a double one, if we can get it just right. Can you hear that? Therefore it illustrates that you can reflect these radio waves with the conductors.

Now we have here a piece of flexible wave-guide which is of course a very good conductor of this radio energy. It is just a hollow flexible piece of metal, and it does not matter what shape it is in; it can be straight or crooked.

There is one other thing that I can demonstrate with this equipment, and this will illustrate the problem of crossing Lake Ontario. Here is a direct radio wave and I am going to reflect another one. As I move this up and down you can hear the phase of this wave come in and out, and you will hear the thing louder and weaker. At that point you are in phase. I think that is a fair demonstration. It does not matter which way you go.

Now, gentlemen, that is the demonstration and I thank you very much. I am open to questions if you wish to ask any.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Young. It was very interesting, and I will now ask Mr. McCann to express proper words of thanks on behalf of the committee.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, some two or three months ago I was intrigued by an article in a scientific magazine which was sent to me by the Assistant to the President, Mr. Dochstader, of the Bell Telephone Company. It was so interesting that I read it two or three times,

partly from the point of view of having a better knowledge of recent developments in electronics, and the thought struck me then that it might be a good idea, when the radio committee sat if they could have copies of the article, and the more practical thing of having a demonstration here today, so I took it upon myself to invite Mr. Dochstader to supply us with an electronics engineer, who happens to be Mr. Young, to put on this practical demonstration. I want to thank the Bell Telephone Company, Mr. Dochstader and Mr. Young, for this very interesting demonstration of something in which we, the radio committee of the House of Commons, are intensely interested. To me at least it always adds to my knowledge when I am able to use my visual senses in making an appraisal of the value of these things, than if I read about it or am told about it. Therefore I think that today's demonstration has been of great benefit to all who have been here today.

I thank you and I wish you to convey to Mr. Eadie of the Bell Telephone Company the appreciation of the members of this committee of the House of Commons because, as a result of the demonstration, we all have a better idea of those matters which affect the very interests which we are considering as the committee on radio broadcasting. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee to continue to sit, or shall we adjourn until tomorrow when Mr. Murdoch will be before us as a witness for the Musicians' Union?

Mr. FLEMING: Then we will resume on Tuesday with Mr. Dunton's evidence?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Fleming.



## EVIDENCE

MAY 27, 1955,  
11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

As previously announced to the committee, we have here this morning Mr. Walter M. Murdoch, executive officer for Canada of the American Federation of Musicians. It is understood, I believe, that Mr. Murdoch will read his brief and we will question him after it has been read. Is that agreeable to the committee?

Agreed.

**Mr. Walter M. Murdoch, Executive Officer for Canada of the American Federation of Musicians, called:**

The WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I say that there is a typographical error in the title on the cover. Musicians occasionally do make an error. It should read, "American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada."

Mr. Chairman and hon. members: as Executive Officer for Canada of the American Federation of Musicians, I wish to express the gratitude of the Canadian membership for the privilege of appearing before this body on its behalf.

I scarcely need say that the role of the musicians in broadcasting—radio and television—is a vital one; that the musician is an integral part of the broadcasting industry; without music, radio and television would be lifeless things indeed.

In reading the evidence of the 1955 committee—and the hon. members can be sure that I read it each year with interest and diligence—I have seen several references to the place of unions in broadcasting, specifically the Federation of Musicians. By inference a number of these references have not been precisely favorable; certainly there has been a degree of misapprehension over, and misinterpretation of, union policy. I feel it reasonable, therefore, to state the case of the American Federation of Musicians vis-a-vis broadcasting in Canada.

Let me say here that the name "American Federation of Musicians" does not imply "foreign" or "American" control of the destinies of Canadian musicians. Our name is a geographic accident and a convenience of association. Music is an international commodity: in North America it knows no boundaries and flows back and forth across the border from broadcast transmitters and by way of travelling dance bands, concert artists and ballet and grand opera companies. Canadian musicians find employment in the United States, and American musicians find employment in this country. They are equal partners in an honored profession. The oldtime dance fiddler in Brandon, Manitoba, as a member of the federation, has the same status as the conductor of the New York Philharmonic.

When the American Federation of Musicians came into being in 1896 the Toronto Musicians' Union had been in existence for nine years. The

federation began chartering Canadian locals in 1900, and in 1913, at the international convention in Toronto, the United States flag was removed from the official emblem of the federation, in order that it be regarded as a truly international union.

The constitution of the American Federation of Musicians requires that at least one member of the executive board be a Canadian living in Canada. (The member at this time is myself.)

Moreover, the Canadian locals of the A.F. of M.—like all locals of the organization—are autonomous bodies. Each elects its own officers, sets its own scale of pay, collects its own dues, and selects its own delegates for the annual international convention. At the annual convention these delegates in turn enact or amend by-laws and elect the officers for the coming year. All international executive officers, including the president (since 1940 Mr. James C. Petrillo), are elected each year by secret ballot.

The president does what his membership tells him. As executive officer for Canada, I do what my membership tells me. Our union is not run by a “czar” or “dictator”, whatever some critics may claim.

The finances of the federation are subject to the most careful scrutiny and are audited by a highly reputable firm of public accountants. Membership to the union is open to any professional musician, and at a reasonable fee. There are two restrictions to membership: no fascists or communists are accepted, and an applicant must be a citizen of the United States or Canada, or have declared intention to become a citizen. Blind musicians are accepted without initiation fee and pay no dues, but enjoy full membership privileges and rights.

In Canada the American Federation of Musicians has 11,865 members, in 32 locals, from Atlantic to Pacific. Membership has been increasing at the rate of about 300 a year, a slightly higher rate, on a per capita basis, than in the United States.

The professional musicians you hear on the radio and see or hear on television are, on the whole, members of the federation. This is because the federation has agreements with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and because virtually all private stations, on those relatively rare occasions when they do use live musicians, recognize the union's place in the framework of music; also, the phonograph records which we all hear in such profusion on local radio programs are made, again almost entirely, by federation musicians.

As far as I know, the federation is the oldest union in the broadcasting industry in Canada. In recent years the actors and writers have formed their own unions, as have the engineers and newsmen. So that today a large proportion of the creative, performing and technical side of broadcasting is organized on trade union lines.

When the musicians began to form their union in the late 19th century, the life of a professional musician in North America was a precarious, and poorly paid one. Conditions improved in the early 20th century, but the musicians have passed through at least two major crises. One was the advent of talking pictures in 1927, which within a year or so threw 20,000 motion picture theatre musicians out of work. The other was the ascendancy of the phonograph record in the mid-thirties and early forties.

Radio stations had found that it was a good deal cheaper to buy phonograph records and play them over and over again than to hire live musicians. The musician was paid once for his work; yet that work could be played endless times without further gain to him, but with gain to the broadcaster, who could build commercial programs around recordings.

The threat of mechanized music became so great that, in 1942, after negotiations for a royalty arrangement with the record manufacturers broke



down, recording was stopped by the union for several months. This dispute finally was settled, after years of negotiation, in the establishment of the Music Performance Trust Fund, a positively unique device, to which I will refer briefly later on.

Despite this settlement, however, and despite the existence of contracts with broadcasters and others, the economic position of the vast majority of musicians in Canada is still precarious.

Considering the investment in time and in instruments that a professional musician will make in his lifetime, the lack of economic stability in the profession, the little promise that the musician has for substantial, or even decent, earnings, is unfortunate and certainly limits the number who reach professional status.

To play regularly on radio or television a musician must be highly proficient. No second-raters need apply. To reach this state of proficiency he must spend many years and many dollars taking instruction and studying. Good instruments are extremely expensive—a bassoon can cost \$1,500, trombone equipment \$1,400 and a violin anywhere from \$500 to \$25,000. When the amount of available professional work is so limited, it is natural that a man or woman, however talented, will think twice before dedicating a lifetime to a career of music.

Agreed that compared with what he got twenty or thirty years ago, the steadily employed musician is reasonably well paid. Indeed, some of our leading performers and arrangers manage to make a very good living. But I deliberately emphasize the phrase "steadily employed". Of the nearly 12,000 "professional" musicians—that is, musicians who work for pay—in the federation in Canada, only a relatively small proportion make their entire living, or even most of their living, out of music.

In cities outside Toronto and Montreal many members of local symphony orchestras are doctors, lawyers, dentists, plumbers, salesmen and so on—in other words, everything but full-time musicians. There simply is not enough to go around. I would certainly hesitate myself before advising a young person to embark on a career as a professional musician under today's limited opportunities.

Fortunately network and commercial radio and television broadcasting do provide important employment for musicians and the C.B.C. particularly does much to foster and stimulate Canadian musical talent. At the same time, our sparseness of population reduces this important employment to two or three major production centres, notably Toronto and Montreal. As a result, musicians in cities even as large as Ottawa can benefit only slightly from broadcast employment.

For example, of the 373 federation musicians in the capital city, only six, let me repeat that, only six, are employed regularly on radio. These six are musicians playing on a "western" music program (something of an incongruity for an eastern city) broadcast once a week from Ottawa to the network.

In recent years the proportion of expenditures on music in relation to over-all program expenditures by the C.B.C. has remained fairly constant: in fact, it has risen slightly. On the other hand, the 153 private stations in Canada provide a relatively small degree of live musical employment. I am heartened by references by the chairman of the C.B.C. to the increased usage of live talent—including musical, I presume—on privately owned stations, but on the whole the amount of employment is still limited. During 1954, according to the federation's records, only 40 out of the 153 private stations gave employment to live musicians. (If any member of the committee is interested in the exact amount of employment given by any station, I will be very glad to supply the details after completion of this brief.)

I should like to add here that the rates of pay for musicians in the employ of the C.B.C. in radio have not changed in five years, as we are still operating under an agreement signed in 1950. Our television agreement dates from July, 1952.

Several references have been made in the proceedings of this committee to the contractual conditions concerning live music performances on the C.B.C. I must say, with all respect to the members, that not all references have shown an understanding of the problems involved.

First of all, let me make it clear that the federation does not simply draw up a list of employment conditions and rates of pay and hand them to the C.B.C. and say, "sign here, or else." The trade agreements are brought about as a result of a meeting of minds—as a result of usually long and always earnest discussions between the corporation and the federation.

At the same time the federation is sufficiently realistic in its thinking to know that broadcasting has its day-to-day problems, and I am sure that the C.B.C. will be glad to witness that through the years we have not been inflexible in the interpretation of our trade agreements and many times have given the necessary cooperation to meet special situations.

The federation, as a matter of course, puts in its contracts specific limitation on the re-use of an original performance whether in tape recordings of broadcasts, kinescopes or films of live television programs, or in the sound track of a motion picture.

The musician, as I have pointed out, knows from bitter experience that his work can be reproduced mechanically for endless replays and that each replay deprives him of potential employment. The author of a piece of fiction sells his work for specified reproduction; his contract usually limits the publisher to a described use. A painter is similarly protected. The musician feels that he merits the same degree of protection.

In the evidence before this committee it has been said, in effect, that "union rules" prevent, by way of making too expensive, the feeding of Canadian programs to United States networks. I know that Mr. Bushnell has interjected that this is not a rule of the musicians' union. But I wish to make the point once more: our agreement on radio broadcasting with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation does permit the feeding to the U.S. of any radio musical program without extra charge.

Our agreement respecting television is for domestic broadcasting only and does not cover live transmissions to the U.S. If a program is kinescoped or filmed for delayed transmission to the U.S. or any other foreign country our contract with the C.B.C. specifies an additional payment to the artists of 50 per cent of the live program fees.

We feel that such protection is justified in television as it is a much more complex medium than radio and involves not just one but two methods of communication, sight and sound.

There have been references, also, to "stand-by" fees paid to the federation for amateur musicians appearing on radio or television, or in public performances. That is to say that when an amateur, whether juvenile or adult, goes on a show, the regular fee which would have gone to a professional musician is paid to the federation.

This is simply a protective device for the professional musicians and is not, as some like to picture it, a calculated piece of discrimination against amateur talent. After all, amateur talent in general seeks to become professional. But the federation does not tolerate amateur talent taking legitimate jobs away from the working musician.



The federation refuses to recognize, for example, the legitimacy of a sports promoter or other entrepreneur employing, on the basis of a donation, a high school band or military band at a function to which the public pays admission. It demands that if professional musicians are not employed then "stand-by" fees are paid to the federation.

The federation, on the other hand, raises no obstacle to the legitimate appearance in public or on the air, of musical organizations where the theme is educational, charitable or of a public service nature, and customary "stand-by" fees are waived.

We have agreements similar to our agreements in the broadcasting industry, with concert halls, public auditoria, hotels, theatres, and so on. These, in effect, say that only union musicians will be employed. But when public school or high school orchestras appear in these places for concerts sponsored by the Board of Education—as in Toronto—to give one example, the federation gladly gives permission. When the huge Metropolitan Opera group comes to Toronto for the annual engagement at Maple Leaf Gardens no stand-by fees are claimed. This is because the appearances are sponsored by a service club and the proceeds are for charity.

By the same token, the federation recognizes that when military bands take part in such events as the opening of parliament or when they play for regular regimental or garrison functions, and when these events are broadcast, televised or filmed for newsreels, that this is legitimate news coverage and requires no special fee. Similarly, the annual Santa Claus parade, in Toronto, involving a great many bands, has been completely covered in the past by radio and television, and I believe by newsreels, without claim on the parade's sponsor.

Exceptions are also made where the cause is just or the circumstances unusual. For example, the Toronto local of the federation has very recently been engaged in negotiations which it was hoped would bring the Kitsilano Boys Band of British Columbia to Toronto for a free concert—at which the local would make no claim for stand-by fees. It was felt that this was the case of an outstanding young musical organization which deserved increased public recognition.

I referred earlier to the Music Performance Trust Funds, which came into being as the basis for settlement of the long dispute between the federation and the recording industry.

A certain small proportion—equivalent to a royalty—on each phonograph record sold is turned over to an impartial trustee in New York City. (In 1950, fees from television films involving musicians were included in this arrangement.) The trustee, in turn, allocates these funds to 654 geographical areas in the United States, Canada, Alaska and Hawaii. Included in this are 30 areas in Canada.

In 1954, \$84,030 was allocated to these 30 Canadian areas.

These funds are non-cumulative and must be spent. And they must be spent specifically on musical projects which are by nature charitable, beneficial or in the public service. Performers are sent to play free in military and civilian hospitals, in charitable institutions for the young and old, in playgrounds, parks, schools, libraries, museums and other public buildings, and for special patriotic and charitable events.

Let me give you some typical expenditures: In Vancouver last year just under \$7,000 worth of free music and entertainment was provided out of this fund. In Brandon, Manitoba, as an example of a small city, approximately \$400 was spent. In Montreal the total was nearly \$17,000. In Regina it came to nearly \$1,600. In Hamilton it was \$2,850. In my own city of Toronto the total expended was \$20,456.

During the year, the Toronto local, of which I am president, provided entertainment at Sunnybrook, Divadale, Red Chevron, Runnymede, Our Lady of Mercy, Queen Elizabeth Lodge, Laughlen Lodge; for the Canadian Institute for the blind, the Salvation Army, the Canadian Organization for Rehabilitation through Training, known as the O.R.T. Federation, the Cerebral Palsy Association and the City of Toronto. We also gave many free concerts at city and suburban schools.

Everything from military bands to concert orchestras and dance bands to small groups and individual musicians were involved.

The foregoing were activities carried out under the Music Performance Trust Funds.

In addition to activities paid for out of the trust funds, our various locals give tens of thousands of dollars worth of free time for various charitable and community projects. In Ottawa, for example, the local recently gave \$1,321 worth of music for the "Springtime Party" of the Ottawa Philharmonic Orchestra, which is held annually to raise funds for the orchestra.

In 1954 members of the Toronto local of the federation provided \$28,500 worth of free music and entertainment for various special projects. These included over \$12,000 in services for the Hurricane Relief Fund, and I may add that our Montreal local have graciously sent us their cheque as a donation to this Toronto disaster fund for \$100, which we appreciate very much, and \$6,900 for the annual Easter Seal Broadcast from Maple Leaf Gardens, to name two events which will be familiar to the members of the Committee. We already have done much in special projects in 1955, including \$3,700 worth of free music for the St. Michael's Hospital Fund and \$10,417 worth for this year's Easter Seal Show.

In 1950, to alleviate suffering in the great national disasters of the Winnipeg flood and the Cabano and Rimouski fires, a special relief program was held in Maple Leaf Gardens and broadcast nationally. The musicians in Canada gave over \$20,000 in free services and cash donations to these funds. The members of the Toronto Symphony alone provided \$8,200 worth of free entertainment.

In my files I have a great many unsolicited testimonials and sincere letters of gratitude from organizations across Canada for the contribution of time, talent and money given by the membership of the American Federation of Musicians in Canada.

The last section is perhaps not precisely relevant to the investigations of this committee, but it is put forward as an illustration of the fact that the philosophy of the members of the federation is by no means all take and no give, as is the picture drawn in some quarters.

I have tried to illustrate, too, that the federation in Canada recognizes clearly that it has an important stake in the broadcasting industry, in both the public and private aspects, and fully accepts its responsibilities as a member of that industry. It is not capricious in its attitude nor casuistic in its dealings. It makes a contract: it lives up to it (the American Federation of Musicians has never broken nor reneged on a contract); and in return it expects the other party to live up to his end.

The federation above all is vitally concerned with the furtherance of the musical culture of this country, for without a healthy environment—which in turn means a reasonable return to the musician for his labors—music in Canada cannot continue to enjoy even the degree of success it now does.

Mr. Chairman, I have a note that I made this morning, if you will permit me to make reference to it now so that I will not further disturb this hon. committee with my raucous voice:

"C.B.C. Regulation 13(1):

With respect to the regulation requiring the employment of live talent between the hours of 7.30 to 11 p.m. except with the previous



consent in writing of the corporation, our agreement with the C.B.C. provides that the C.B.C. will give a list of any extensions of recordings and transcription time given to individual stations during such period.

We feel that this provision of our agreement should be now implemented in view of the fact that our members are not receiving a fair portion of employment from the individual stations."

Our television agreement with the C.B.C. includes this: it is now common practice for the corporation to supply kinescopes to the private stations free of charge. These are reproductions of a program outside of the federation's arrangement with the corporation, and the federation feels that these private stations—I should not say that the corporation feels, but the federation feels—that these private stations should pay something for that. Where you have the case of 153 private stations in Canada, and when only 40 of them give employment, we resent very much the corporation giving our services "buckshee" to those stations which give no employment whatsoever to our members; and we would like to work that out in negotiations with the C.B.C., Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for listening to me.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the brief read, and you have listened to it very carefully. If the members have any questions to ask of Mr. Murdoch, he is ready to answer them.

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. Mr. Murdoch, you said in the early part of your brief that you were a member of the board of the American Federation of Musicians. How many constitute the full board?—A. Five, sir, four in the United States, and one in Canada. They think that is a reasonable representation for Canada.

*By Mr. Reinke:*

Q. There was a comment in the committee at one of our prior meetings. It will be found on page 26 of our proceedings. It was pointed out there that a recording by a band or orchestra would cost about three times the amount that you would pay for a live broadcast. Would you please comment on that?—A. Would you please repeat your question?

Q. The assertion was made in answer to a question with respect to tape recordings that it would cost about three times as much for a tape recording that it would cost for a live broadcast.—A. Our business is extremely complex. I have read the proceedings, and I think this committee has been very patient. In the first place, recordings whether on tape or on disc come under a special category. For instance, we have a fee for a sideman, that is, one of the members of the orchestra. For one hour of service, of which 15 minutes can be transcribed, his fee is \$27. The fee of the leader is double; and whether it is one man or fifty men, it is just a matter of arithmetic as to what would be the cost.

On a live broadcast, the member would get \$8 for half an hour; and he would get \$4 per hour for rehearsals. No, that has been changed. The rate is now \$5 for rehearsals in television, and \$10 is the fee for a sustaining program. I would refer to a sustaining programme as one given by a station, and the commercial fee is \$12 for half an hour. There is a category for those rates which are all covered in our agreement with the C.B.C.

Q. Once a recording is taped, it can be used at the discretion of the broadcaster indefinitely.—A. No. There again there is a classification of what is known as a "dingle" or regular distributed programme which is made for one hearing. Usually it is done for the convenience of the corporation or our membership, in that instead of it being made live, they make a transcription.

In television there are two categories. One is for kinescope which must be made simultaneously with the telecasting. If it is made at any other time, it comes under the film agreement which is in another category which is also covered in our agreement.

I assure that the C.B.C. is managed most effectively so far as we are concerned. They do not think any more of ten cents than you do of your right eye. So any fees they paid out during the year are covered in the trade agreement.

*By Mr. Holowach:*

Q. On page 4 you mention membership fees. What is the membership fee for a professional musician?—A. It cannot be more than \$50, because the federation restricts it. In some locals it is as low as \$10, but it must not exceed \$50.

Q. Is it a yearly fee?—A. No. That is the initiation fee. Now, the dues in the locals vary. In Toronto it is \$10; in Montreal, I think, \$22, which includes an insurance policy, a death policy, and all sorts of things. In Ottawa it is \$6. In Hamilton, I read by the record that it is \$6.

Q. You said that no fascists or communists would be eligible. I suppose you mean that if some musician is known for his political activity as being a fascist or a communist, he would be barred from membership?—A. That is right. Our only difficulty is to prove that he is a fascist or a communist.

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. How do you define those terms?

Mr. STUDER: Can you tell by his music?

The CHAIRMAN: That is a good question!

The WITNESS: You may have something there! Suppose a person is openly associated with such an organization. Our constitution has clauses in it which are more daring than any political party in Canada would dare to put in their program, and I say that with great respect. I have with me here one or two copies of our application form. We try to get them before they come in. Here it is:

(a) Are you at present or been in the past member of the communist party? Answer yes or no.

(b) Do you have any leaning toward the communist party or assist this party by any action that might further the progress of this party knowingly? Answer yes or no.

No. 10 are you a member of any branch of the armed forces of the United States or Canada?

Those are the clauses. We have three paragraphs and if any member of the committee is interested, I would be glad to give him a copy of the International Constitution, which, I suggest to you, you proposed as being very good.

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. Where are the paragraphs dealing with fascists?—A. They are the same thing.

Q. Where are they?—A. They are in the constitution which I will submit to you. There are three very excellent paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN: Would it be agreeable to the committee if we put this in as an appendix? I refer to the application form.

Agreed. (*See Appendix*).



*By Mr. Holowach:*

Q. Do you know of any case where some musician visiting this country, such as an international celebrity, has been refused, or where a situation has been created wherein your organization has protested the performance given by such an artist in auditoria which have contracts with your union?—A. I do not understand your question.

Q. Is there any case that you know of where a musician from another country . . .—A. You mean an instrumental musician?

Q. Yes, where a musician from another country, coming here to perform in one of the houses which have contracts with your organization—a union house—is there any case where you have protested such a visit?—A. No. We would not protest. If a musician from the United States came to play, let us say, in Massey Hall, he would probably be a member of the federation, and we would expect that musician to respect our contractual or trade agreement with Massey Hall. I mean that the fact that he is a member of the federation would not permit him to dilute any contract which we had.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. In regard to this communist clause in your application form, suppose a member of your organization says: "No, I am not a communist." Yet after a period of time you find that he is. Have you a screening set up in your organization?—A. We have. On the bottom of the application there is printed a "grandmother" clause which reads as follows.

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. Did you say: "grandmother" clause?—A. Yes. My counsel, Mr. McMaster, has used that term on occasion.

Q. What law school did he graduate from?

Mr. FLEMING: From the best in the country, Osgoode Hall Law School!

The CHAIRMAN: Will you please continue, Mr. Murdoch.

The WITNESS: The obligation is that if he does not answer any of the questions truthfully—in other words, has any mental reservations of any kind—his membership becomes null and void.

We have had little white lies, you know, on previous occasions, but nothing serious.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. That does not answer my question. What I want to know is: if a man, in his application to your union said that he was not a communist, yet you found out that he was, what is the process of elimination from then on?—A. That is a hypothetical question.

Q. No, it is not. It is quite a practical question.—A. Because it has never arisen, but if it did I am sure we would be able to deal with it.

Q. You have thousands of members of your union, among whom there must be some communists because we find them everywhere.—A. We have one communist in the Ontario legislature.

Q. Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: You mean in the former Ontario legislature. There is no Ontario legislature at this moment.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. What procedure do you have to find if there are any communists in your union?—A. If we suspected a man, we would ask him directly at a board meeting. For example, some of our people flitted behind the Iron curtain for

culture. We have asked them, because of their association with some of the organizations which the city police say are leftist on the telephone. The R.C.M.P. also are good enough to screen all of the communist literature which comes to me, and I get a great deal of it. I do not open it. I just write "R.C.M.P." on it. They must have a terrific library in Toronto. I have not the time to read it.

We would ask them directly: "Are you a communist"? Of course they always say "No". But we have got to prove it; and if Mr. Goode will give us a better method of proving it than we have, I would be glad to have it.

Q. That still does not answer my question.—A. We have not any machinery.

Q. Suppose you find out that a man is a communist; I suppose automatically you would take steps to put him out of your union.—A. That is true. He would appear before the board, and if the members of the board decided that he was a communist, then they would immediately expel him.

Q. Which board would he appear before?—A. Before his local board.

Q. It would be done by the local board?—A. That is right. And he then has the right of appeal against any decision by the local board to the international executive board.

Q. You say that he has the right to appeal to the American board of which you are a member?—A. The international board.

Q. Then we have this position: if a local board says that a man is a communist, that man can appeal to the international board, and we have the position of an American board, with an American majority on it, saying that a Canadian is a communist, when perhaps your local Canadian affiliation might think entirely differently.—A. Isn't that going rather far afield?

Q. Is it not true?—A. May I give you an illustration: At the convention of the American Federation of Musicians in Chicago, an alternative delegate took the floor and proposed a resolution. While he was on the floor another member rose and said: "Mr. Chairman, the speaker ran for the mayoralty of a New England city on the communist ticket". Of course the newspaper men began to write furiously. You could smell the lead burning. He was brought before the board, and the board instructed his local to expel him from the federation. That is how it was handled in a democratic way. It was not a matter of a small board; it was the general membership, the delegates covering the United States and Canada.

Q. Could I have a yes or no answer on this: am I correct in saying that the international board of your union has the right to say to a Canadian "You are a communist", and to expel him?—A. No. My answer is no!

Q. If the local board says that a man is a communist, and he appeals, you have told us that he must appeal to the international board.—A. Yes, and he would have his day in court.

Q. And the international board will decide. Suppose he is a Canadian who comes, let us say, from perhaps Vancouver. He is a communist, and they will make the final decision on whether he is a communist. Will you please answer yes or no?—A. No. They can allow or disallow his appeal.

Q. If they disallow it, that means that they officially say that he is a communist.—A. No.

Q. Then who does?—A. His local says that he is a communist; and when he gets through with the federation he will have his day in court.

Q. This man has been before his local board which says that he is a communist. Then he appeals to the international board which is made up of four American members and yourself as the Canadian member, and they will decide the case, whether or not he is a communist?—A. They do not. They may deny his appeal against the local action, and he has a perfect right to have his day in court.



Q. I think the chairman will allow me to require an answer on that. Does the international board finally decide that this man is a communist?—A. The answer is no!

Q. Then what would the board do?—A. They would simply disallow his appeal.

Q. That is to say, they would decide that he was a communist?—A. They do not.

*By Mr. Boisvert:*

Q. Mr. Murdoch, at page 4 of your brief you mentioned that you have 11,860 members in your organization. Have you any statistics to show how many of them are Canadian-born citizens?—A. They must be either Canadian citizens or citizens of the United States; and whenever they come to the country they must wait for one year before they join; they must state their intention of becoming Canadian citizens.

Q. But you have no statistics to show how many are Canadian citizens and how many are aliens?—A. No—pardon me; I would say that at least 98 per cent are Canadian babies.

Q. 98 per cent?—A. Yes.

Q. You say also in your brief, at page 2, that Canadian musicians find employment in the United States and that American musicians find employment in this Country. Have you any figures to show how many Canadian musicians found employment last year in the United States?—A. In the National Ballet which toured the United States there were a number of Canadian musicians and singers in it—any number of them. Unfortunately too many of our Canadian musicians are going to the United States.

Q. And how many musicians from the United States are coming to this country?—A. The disadvantage is ours. We are sending more than we are getting.

Mr. FLEMING: The Toronto Symphony Orchestra and the Mendelssohn Choir and similar organizations have performed in American cities?

The WITNESS: Yes. Four major orchestras are chosen to go to New York every year. Boyd Neil, the dean of the Toronto Conservatory of Music has a fine string group and has made tours of the United States and will make others.

*By Mr. Boisvert:*

Q. In answering a question of Mr. Holowach you said that the initiation fee is \$50. What is the annual fee of the local?—A. In Hamilton and Ottawa it is \$6 a year, in Montreal it is \$22 because of the insurance and everything, and in Toronto it is \$10.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you give us the reason for the difference between Montreal and Toronto?

The WITNESS: We have a limited sick benefit and death benefit, they have a complete insurance policy covering their members.

Mr. REINKE: Do all the locals have a sick and a death benefit?

The WITNESS: I would not know that.

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. On page four of your brief it refers to agreements between the union and the C.B.C. I suppose this question might be more properly directed to the C.B.C. What are those agreements and the dates?—A. The radio agreement is July 1950 and the television agreement is I think July 1952.

Mr. BOISVERT: It is your brief I believe.

*By Mr. Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace):*

Q. There is a musicians performance trust fund. Have you any idea what amount is paid into this fund by Canadian companies, Canadian recording producers?—A. I am sorry you asked that question because it is infinitesimal. There is one new recording company headed by Mr. McKelkin, Q.C., in Toronto known as The Beaver who have done recordings of the Toronto Symphony and other groups, and the Hallmark have also done some. But Canadian recording is very small.

Q. But I take it that this is based on records sold?—A. Yes.

Q. So that actually the amount paid into the trust fund would eventually be a reflection of the number of records sold in Canada?—A. No. Our share is based on the over-all sale of records in North America.

Q. Your share which comes into Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. What I am getting at is the amount paid into this fund?—A. By Canadian recording companies?

Q. Yes.—A. I would be very glad to give you that figure, but I cannot give it to you now.

Q. I am not talking about the new recording companies but RCA Victor and Decca, both of whom I understand operate in Canada and the United States. You do not have that amount here?—A. It is certainly very minor or infinitesimal compared to the over-all picture of recordings.

Q. Would you say it is more or less than the amount Canada draws back?—A. It would be 5 per cent of what we draw.

Q. So it means, since it has the same relationship to the number of records which are being sold, between Canada and the United States, 95 per cent more of the total production of records are being sold in the United States?—A. Yes.

Q. What use is made of this money apart from providing free performance?—A. That is the only use. Not one five cents worth is spent on advertising or on money spent for a vehicle to take the large units to an engagement.

Q. Apart from administrative charges?—A. There are no administrative charges of ours.

Q. Part of that is paid back?—A. 100 per cent is.

Q. Have you any idea of the amount of standby fees collected in radio performance in a year?—A. There was a figure given by the C.B.C. and my memory is that it was around 4 or 500,000. Another member raised the question whether this money went to the head of the musician's union in Canada and I will state here not one penny went to either Mr. Petrillo, who does not need it, nor that one penny went to me, and I do need it; it goes to the relief fund of the local.

Q. You have heard of ASCAP?—A. Yes.

Q. Does any of the revenue collected by ASCAP find its way to the American Federation of Musicians?—A. Not one penny. Those members of ASCAP who produce an original composition get a royalty collected by ASCAP or KAPAC in Canada. That is in relation to the recordings in Canada and it is really peanuts.

*By Mr. Dinsdale:*

Q. I was interested to read on page 12 of the brief that considerable exceptions are made to the standby fee procedure. You say:

The federation, on the other hand, raises no obstacle to the legitimate appearance in public or on the air, of musical organizations where the scene is educational, charitable, or of a public service nature, and customary 'standby' fees are waived.



Apparently that applies particularly to amateur groups?—A. Yes.

Q. Amateur bands for example?—A. Yes. In cases where no admission is charged. You are all familiar with Vancouver, the beautiful city in the west—

Mr. GOODE: Mention that word quite often please.

The WITNESS: I understand that Burbank is just adjacent to Vancouver and on one Easter morning out there the natives had a sunrise service. They get up at 5.00 o'clock in the morning and have these services. One of them involved the C.B.C. We had a call from the director of Music of the C.B.C. who said that the citizens are not generally awake at that time and might they delay that until two o'clock. The band involved was the Shrine Band which was not entirely composed of members of the federation. We said that as long as it did not replace a live programme that the citizens of Vancouver might hear that it could be put on at two o'clock.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Were they up then?

The WITNESS: I will give you another example. They had a concert at Carnegie Hall of beautiful original Canadian music, and the conductor, Mr. Stokowski, started out with 60 men. Those of us who know that great conductor knew he would finish up with 90 men and he did; he had a choir. The C.B.C. thought that it must broadcast that concert in the interests of Canadian music. It occurred on a Friday evening when they had commitments for the Promenade Symphony in Toronto and they wanted to know what it would cost to have a transcription made and broadcast that in Canada. When I found out the cost I shuddered; it was nearly \$19,000. I discussed it with the president of the federation and told him that as far as the C.B.C. is concerned this is a "must". I said that I doubt if the programme is worth \$19,000 and he said to me if you feel it is in the interest of Canadian music tell the C.B.C. they may take it at cost. I called Mr. Bushnell—and I made sure he was sitting down—and I told him he could take that for nothing provided he gave me an assurance that the due credit would be given to the American Federation of Musicians. When I got the record it did not contain any credit line to the federation. We could have said to the C.B.C., of course, that you must broadcast this other programme and keep to the terms of the agreement. But it was not a realistic point of view and we appreciated their problem.

*By Mr. Dinsdale:*

Q. On this point of amateur musicians, I imagine you are familiar with the fact that the high school band has not developed as rapidly in Canada as in the United States. In the case of a high school band, would that band be allowed to perform on a local radio station with the American Federation of Musicians' permission?—A. If there was no admission charged and the application was a new one it could be granted. But may I suggest to you that these young men playing in high school organizations and studying, hope, when they graduate to pay their way through university and through their profession and make it possible to do that by the fees which they earn. There is quite a difference between the boy who is sixteen years of age playing in the high school band and the boy of seventeen who joins and says "What are these people doing competing with me?" I have a great interest in boy's bands. I attended my first rehearsal and then had my seventh birthday two weeks later, so I am sympathetic and I know something about it. We do permit it, but again there is the matter of competition.

Q. In your brief you make specific reference to the Kitsilano Boy's Band. That would be a network programme?—A. No. I have known the conductor of the Kitsilano Boy's Band for years. He is very interested in the boys and gives them a lot of instruction. In turn, we in Toronto receive applications

quite frequently from members of that band to come down for further study and to join the association. They are on tour now and the son of Mr. Delamonte suggested they could be in Toronto on May 16 and they wanted to arrange a concert in a church or auditorium to help them with their fees. I said, knowing Toronto or the Canadian audience, that if there is an offering they would get only nickels, dimes, and some buttons. I immediately got in touch with the largest English paper in Canada and suggested they might take over the project; meet the boys, give them breakfast, take them on a tour around town, put a concert on at the exhibition grounds, publicize the band, buy them a dinner and perhaps give a donation towards the organization. That was a practical approach to it. The paper was interested but could not do it. I was very disappointed. That was not the first time we have assisted the Kitsilano Boy's Band. But, that band has no right to go on and become competitive on a national network. It is an organization which I think the citizens of British Columbia should get behind and subsidize or help and do something similar to what the province of Quebec are doing under Dr. Wilfred Pelletier, to help those boys develop professionally.

Mr. GOODE: I think I should say that the people of Vancouver have been very kind to Mr. Delamonte and the Kitsilano Boy's Band. The people of Vancouver have certainly done a lot towards keeping that band together and I think we should give them the credit.

The WITNESS: I agree with you.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: You mention there are 11,865 Canadian members of the federation. What is the total of the United States membership?

The WITNESS: The combined total is about 250,000.

*By Mr. Carter:*

Q. Mr. Murdoch, in the case of the Guy Lombardo band which is advertised to appear in Montreal, would that band pay standby fees to the Montreal local?—A. No, not if the band appeared as a theatrical arrangement.

Q. They are advertised to appear on Sunday, May 29.—A. We are very delighted to have a Canadian band come back home.

Q. I was interested on page 11 of your brief in which you mention the job done in developing Canadian talent. Can you give me some idea, or some comparison, of the job in developing Canadian talent as done by the C.B.C. and the private stations? How does the total job done by the private stations compare with the total job done by the C.B.C.?—A. Of course it does not compare. I think the chairman of the C.B.C. in being asked whether talent had improved over the years answered in the affirmative and said that there was a great surplus of fine instrumentalists; and I may say to you that on the C.B.C. for a man to get into that circle he must be a better man than the man who is in. For instance, the C.B.C. have a very excellent symphony orchestra on Monday nights. I went to their concert in Massey Hall. They have brought conductors from all over Canada to conduct that orchestra and it has been a real educational thing for the people of Canada. One member of this committee said that he has an ear for music. May I suggest you need two ears to appreciate music and that the area about the ears is possibly more important than the ears. Every type of music was presented. The C.B.C. has made a great contribution. We are not their cousins and we speak very frankly with each other at times. But they have made a very great contribution. I think it is unthinkable that out of 153 private stations that only 40 of them employ musicians.



*By Mr. Studer:*

Q. You said there were only forty out of 153 that employ musicians, and it would appear in regard to that profession that it would be one of the most unstable professions in existence. There is no way for a musician to determine what his earnings might be unless he is permanently employed?—A. You are quite right.

Q. And as a result of that a musician necessarily would have to have another occupation as the situation now stands. The only alternative to that I imagine would be a guaranteed annual wage. The question of a guaranteed annual wage appears to have some prominence at the present time and they apparently would be as much entitled to it as anyone. Definitely there is a need for more music in the world and less talking.

The CHAIRMAN: More harmony.

Mr. STUDER: I think there is a necessity throughout the whole country for a better understanding of music which would create more of a demand for it. How are we to be educated? Music is something like a painting; how does one come to appreciate a good painting? Something similar is in evidence in music because it usually describes a situation which we, with no idea of music, do not appreciate. In order to have an appreciation of it you would have to have a course in music, would we not?

The WITNESS: No. I do not know whether this is realistic, but I think the members of the House here in Ottawa, after they have visited a number of spots of entertainment might organize an orchestra, and you would find it a great method of escape.

Mr. STUDER: We surely need that.

The WITNESS: I know you have two very fine musicians in this committee. You have a start with a trumpet and a trombone, and it is simple. In fact many groups of professional men in the states have orchestras, doctors, lawyers and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a choir amongst the Liberal members, Mr. Murdoch.

The WITNESS: I would like to hear it sing.

Mr. FLEMING: You would not say that if you heard them.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. Mr. Murdoch, in regard to the private stations and the employment of musicians, you expressed great satisfaction with the C.B.C., and I certainly agree with you, but I am quite sure you would regret it if these forty private stations discontinued using live talent.—A. Of course we would.

Q. Then I take it you would be in agreement with having more private television stations on the air because there would be more employment provided for musicians?—A. I am sorry, I cannot agree with you. To take the statement made in the House, in this committee, the other day—I have not got the verbatim report and I can only depend upon what I read in the newspapers—you have a loosely knit organization of radio stations which frequently quarrel amongst themselves. I was at one of those donnybrooks at Calgary when they were in the process of firing the general manager. The difference between their organization and the C.B.C. is this, that you gentlemen can bring the C.B.C. here and say: "What did you do and how did you do it and what did you spend," and all about it, but you have not any such control over the private stations. You are all familiar with Bellingham, for instance, and from what I hear about 90 per cent of the telecasts there—and I talked to Victoria just the other day, and Vancouver—

are filmed, such as Amos and Andy, coming in from Bellingham. You just have an influx into Canada of film, and when they say to you that they will use the same process in television as in radio, that is not good enough so far as we are concerned.

Q. Can we take it then, Mr. Murdoch, that you are not in agreement with further private television stations going on the air in Canada?—A. Yes, if the private television stations will make an agreement that they will give a definite commitment to have live programmes on their television stations.

Q. Then the only reason you are against private stations—A. I am not against them; I am for them if they will provide employment.

Q. Please do not turn my words. The reason you are against private stations is that you are not sure that they will employ musicians from your union?—A. No. The difficulty is I am sure that they will not employ them.

Q. You wish to anticipate and to argue then, Mr. Murdoch, with the words that have been spoken by the private station operators who have been before this committee, that they are quite willing to put on a percentage of live programmes on the air. You do not believe that statement?—A. Did they say what percentage?

Q. Neither did anyone else say a percentage. We have had evidence here that 50 per cent of the programmes, not only through the C.B.C., are coming from the United States, and they must necessarily be canned, so we can take it, as they have told us, that they think that the percentage of the same type of programmes would be shown on the private stations. I would rather think, if a number of private television stations were on the air, that your men would get more work. I think that is reasonable, is it not?—A. Mr. Goode, when you are dealing with an industry, as in any other business, it must be responsible, it must have control, discipline within its own ranks.

Q. I am quite sure you are in agreement with that, Mr. Murdoch?—A. And if they had that discipline and would make a commitment and spell out station and position and so on, they certainly would have our blessing. I was fortunate enough to be invited by His Excellency the Governor General on the appointment of Mr. Charlesworth as the chairman of the old corporation. We had a dinner at the York Hotel and the grape juice was excellent. So I was in at the birth of this thing. Mr. McMaster, our counsel, and I were just checking—I am terrifically remiss on dates—to ask him how long his company had been associated with us, and we figured out that it was twenty-three years, so that we have been with this thing from the beginning. There is nothing sadistic about us at all; we feel that if Canadian culture, instrumental culture, is going to get anywhere, it will come from the source of professional musicians who will teach, so that they will not have to romp all over the world to learn how to play the piano or the violin. During my visit to Calgary at the C.A.B. convention, the Palliser Hotel could not provide me with a radio, and I thought it was very important while I was at this meeting that I should get a radio. Therefore I went to a shop and rented one, and I played it, and 90 per cent of the music was western hill-billy. I think that is an insult to the western people, because I do know that such a quartet as the Parlow Quartet receives many of the requests they get for fine music from western Canada. You have a fine symphony in Vancouver, you have one in Calgary and one in Edmonton, they are struggling in Saskatoon and Regina. If the C.B.C. for instance could carry out a survey and, for peanuts, ask each of these people to let them take bits and pieces of a programme and produce it on different stations it would be interesting, but when approached, Dr. Pelletier of the Quebec Symphony—and he is one of our great Canadian musicians—declined. Now those orchestras would never have been heard on the air unless they went on the theory that salvation is free, and, as a Presbyterian, I know that is silly; it costs money to get through the pearly gates.



Q. Of the 153 private stations, how many in total give live musical employment?—A. How many stations?

Q. No, how many persons in total?—A. I could not give you that. I could give it to you in money.

Q. You said in your brief that if any member of the committee was interested in the exact amount of employment given by any station you would provide it?—A. Last night, Mr. Chairman, I made a complete survey and checked my arithmetic, knowing how keen this committee are, and the sheet is in my room. Perhaps Mr. Harris could grab a taxi and get back there and fetch it.

Q. Do you remember it in round figures?—A. No, I would not dare. We will get that sheet. Bring the bundle. I will have it for you and I will tell you precisely what every station paid.

Mr. FLEMING: I think we might tell Mr. Murdoch that that could be sent to the committee later.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you like these figures right now?

Mr. GOODE: I am in no hurry for it now. It is only that I am interested in Mr. Murdoch's views on private stations. I think I would like to have it.

The CHAIRMAN: Right now?

Mr. GOODE: Yes.

The WITNESS: We will get it right now.

*By Mr. Holowach:*

Q. Mr. Murdoch, we understand that the steadily employed musicians are reasonably well paid, but that there are very few such musicians who are steadily employed. Is that correct?—A. That is correct, yes.

Q. Have you any figures to indicate how many members of your federation do make their entire living, or even a portion of it, out of music?—A. No. I could only speak relatively.

Q. Can you give us some figure?—A. We have the secretary of the Montreal local present here—we are very glad to have them—and possibly they could give me their approximation. I would say in the city of Toronto possibly—are you saying now employed on radio and television only?

Q. How many members of your federation make their entire living or most of their living out of music?—A. I could not give you that figure without a survey, but I can tell you as regards the large centres, perhaps Montreal can give me an approximation, and I would say in Toronto about 200.

Q. Now, another question. On page 7 of your brief you state as follows:

“I would certainly hesitate myself before advising a young person to embark on a career as a professional musician under today's limited opportunities.”

A. That is right.

Q. Are there any specific recommendations which your federation makes or recommends to improve this situation?—A. No. This is a national problem, and I do think that, for instance in our conservatories throughout Canada, whether it be done provincially or whether it be done federally, there should be some system of scholarship for those talented children who cannot afford the long years of tuition. I remarked that I was playing at seven, but I did not earn a dollar as a professional musician until I was about twenty-one, and all those years I was studying an instrument and the theory of music.

*By Mr. Dinsdale:*

Q. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the use of live talent for broadcasting, I presume that most of that talent is used in connection with network broadcasting.—A. There is some local broadcasting I think. I want to get the figure for Mr. Goode, and he will see just exactly how much money is spent by each station in the major centres. Vancouver has done very well, Victoria particularly well. You have to differentiate between the sponsored programme and the commercial program, because on the commercial programme the station does make money.

Q. But so far as C.B.C. broadcasting is concerned it would be network broadcasting employing mostly live talents?—A. That is right.

Q. Have you any idea of the concentration of your membership in the larger centres across Canada, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg?—A. Yes, I can give you those figures. I can show you exactly what happens there. As a matter of fact we have many people who have to leave their homes and their families, and so on, who have to move to Toronto and Montreal, whereas if employment was provided for them in their own home town they would have a much more wholesome life. Taking the larger locals, in Toronto we have 2,293, and we shall have to do something about this, because in Montreal they have 2,299; they are up six on us, but we will correct that next month. Vancouver has 732 members; Winnipeg, 410; Kitchener, Ontario, 605; London 490; Hamilton 606 and St. Catharines 487. I am just picking out the larger locals. Calgary has 225.

Q. What about Brandon?—A. Brandon, yes, that is my favourite town.

Mr. DINSDALE: Hear, hear.

The WITNESS: Brandon has 50 members.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Did you give Vancouver?—A. I did, yes; Vancouver has 732.

Mr. DINSDALE: Would you enlarge on that statement that Brandon is your favourite town?

*By Mr. Reinke:*

Q. In going through the evidence in the first book of the minutes of proceedings I came across this piece of evidence upon which I would like you to comment if you would. The question was asked what it would cost to put a professional band on the air.

The CHAIRMAN: What page?

Mr. REINKE: Page 27—how much it would cost to put a professional band on the air, in round figures, and the answer was given that for a 40-piece band for a half-hour show and rehearsal would probably cost \$60 per man or \$600. There seems to be some discrepancy there.

The WITNESS: Did the chairman of the C.B.C. give that?

*By Mr. Reinke:*

Q. That was given by Mr. Bushnell. There seems to be a discrepancy there somewhere.—A. I would like to know from the record when the C.B.C. ever employed 40 men in a professional band to play on the air.

Q. This is a theoretical answer.—A. It would cost the same price if they put 40 orchestral people on the air. I read that, and I thought the arithmetic was reasonably faulty.

Q. I was trying to establish from the point of view of arithmetic whether the \$60 per man or the \$600 was inaccurate.—A. Mr. Reinke, you are talking of radio. The band would be on for half an hour. It would be 40 men plus



the half-hour scale. They would rehearse probably, or they should rehearse ten hours, but I have not convinced the C.B.C. they should, so possibly they would get five hours rehearsal which would be at \$4 an hour, so that would be \$20 multiplied by the number of men. There is nothing unusual about whether it would be a band or an orchestra, it is a comparable scale, covered by our agreement.

Q. It was the \$60 figure that I thought was rather high.—A. It is high. I wish we could get some of that employment.

*By Mr. Dinsdale:*

Q. Mr. Murdoch, what procedure would be necessary to get one of our military bands on the air almost regularly?—A. When you say "a military band" what do you mean?

Q. An air force band.—A. An active service band, you mean?

Q. Yes, an active service band.—A. Unfortunately I have not any power over the air service regulations made by the Minister of National Defence, and I think it is very improper for me to interfere with or try to dilute the regulations made by the minister.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. It has been the case though, Mr. Murdoch, that the R.C.A.F. band and other service bands have been kept away from certain activities by the union, have they not?—A. That is not true. The policy of the government in connection with their recruiting for the army has been to handle it in a perfectly realistic way through an advertising agency who provides the band and they play at regular fees. Now it would be lawfully unfair to the army—and I belong to the army—for the air force to have an advantage over the army or the navy, and so we think that they should follow the standard practice and go through the usual sources.

Q. Is it not right, does not my memory serve me right, that during the regime of I think it was Mr. Powers as the minister that your union, I think I can use the word "stopped" certain bands from going on a recruiting tour?—A. No, we have never stopped a band going on a recruiting tour.

Q. Were you in your present position during the war?—A. Yes. Unfortunately I have been for sixteen years.

Q. I wonder if you would tell the committee just what the story was on that recruiting band procedure?—A. Mr. Chairman, may I say that members of the cabinet and all members of the government are continually pressed by people who want to put on a show and use service bandsmen. They will occasionally invite a minister to appear to open a fair and incidentally say, "Please bring a band with you,"—"Please bring your violin." I had an occasion when a Minister of National Defence came to Toronto for the Army Show, which incidentally is broadcast without fee all over Canada in the interests of recruiting and it was suggested that the minister might speak. The C.B.C. said, "The minister will have two minutes" and the minister had two minutes. Now any army band, any service band, can go on tour, can rent a hall and can put up posters saying, "We are here to recruit members for the permanent forces," and they have our blessing. We have many of our members in the permanent forces, but when they come in to play at an affair for which admission is charged they are in the same category as if they said to the men in the service, "All you men who are electricians fall out to the left, the carpenters on the right. We propose going to the Canadian National Exhibition. You will do the wiring and you will build the stands, and the regular members of those unions will stay at home and applaud." That has nothing to do with recruiting; it is just contriving to save a dollar.

Q. I want to proceed with this a little. This was during the wartime, the country was at war, as I understand it. The R.C.A.F. band was being sent on a commission to assist recruiting. My information is that because of the actions of your union they were not allowed to go.—A. No you are posing a question without any detail.

Q. I am not posing anything.—A. What R.C.A.F. band, where were they going and what were they going to do?

Q. Well, you tell me, Mr. Murdoch.—A. I cannot tell you. There are hundreds of things and I am a very busy man. You give me the specific instance.

Q. I am very busy too and I would like an answer to it, if you do not mind.—A. I cannot answer that sort of question.

Q. You can answer this: did you or did you not as an executive member of your union stop a recruiting tour of an R.C.A.F. band in Canada during wartime?—A. Certainly not, and I am surprised that I am asked such a question.

Q. Well, you do not need to be surprised at what I ask you.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Holowach had not finished. Was there another question you wanted to put?

*By Mr. Holowach:*

Q. There was one other question. The other day we had a very interesting submission made by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. I suppose you read their submission?—A. No, I have not had a chance of doing so yet.

Q. In their submission they made definite recommendations, and I refer to page 1, clause 2, of that brief in which they advocate that an independent regulatory board for Canadian broadcasting be created. Would you mind telling us the attitude of your federation towards such a recommendation?—A. Well of course I do not want to prejudge the royal commission.

Q. No, but we would like to hear the attitude of your federation.—A. Well, do you want a very frank answer?

Q. Absolutely. That is why I asked.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. Has the federation an opinion on that subject?—A. No, the federation has not an opinion but if you want my opinion I will be glad to give it to you for what it is worth.

*By Mr. Holowach:*

Q. Then let us hear it.—A. As a Canadian, individually.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee prepared to accept the answer of Mr. Murdoch as a Canadian and not as the president of the Federation of Musicians? I do not think so. I do not think you can ask that question, Mr. Holowach.

Mr. GOODE: No, because Mr. Murdoch is appearing here as the representative of his union.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I am sorry, Mr. Holowach, but I do not think you should press that question.

Mr. HOLOWACH: I believe that we are here to get the benefit of these people's opinions.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but Mr. Murdoch is appearing as the president of the Association of Musicians, and you cannot ask him to state his opinion as a private individual.

The WITNESS: I have not read the report.



Mr. FLEMING: I think it is a matter of being fair to the witness. Mr. Murdoch comes before us as the leading official of the federation, and he is putting before us a brief for the federation. The views he is expressing to us this morning, as I understand it, are the views of the federation, and if a question leads him outside that to express a personal opinion I do not think it is quite fair to those he is representing here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Holowach can ask the question privately if he wants to.

*By Mr. Studer:*

Q. I do not know whether this is the place to ask it, but I would like to know the percentage of time in broadcasting spent in broadcasting music. Is that in your sphere?—A. We would not know that. I know that for instance the musical content of television shows is less than 10 per cent.

Q. The reason I ask it is this: would it not be in your own interests to endeavour to have more time on the air dedicated to music?—A. Indeed.

Q. Would not that be an angle to work on?—A. Yes, indeed, and we have been working on it.

Q. Keep on. I would like to hear more of it.—A. Thank you, sir.

*By Mr. Carter:*

Q. Mr. Chairman, I have a very short question: in view of the remarks that Mr. Murdoch made earlier about the lack of opportunities, and so forth, has his organization considered, or given any consideration to, the setting up of scholarships out of the funds which they obtain from the standby fees?—A. As a matter of fact, the amount we get for contribution is peanuts. Only the bookkeeper would know they came in at all and he would post them to the relief fund. It is a dying industry. Many of our members teach kiddies for nothing in order to help them. There is not a musical director in a high school in Toronto who is not a member of ours. Many of our members make music a teaching profession and that is the background which will help the profession of music in Canada.

Q. For my own personal information do you have any bagpipe players among your members?—A. Yes. I am sorry Senator Reid has gone to the other place and is not here to uphold the bagpipes. It is a musical instrument, a very difficult one, and we have young men in our organization who have gone to Edinburgh to study there who are back here now. When one of the parties want to have their principal piped to the chair we can provide them with first class musicians to do the piping.

Mr. STUDER: Did you say it was a musical instrument?

The WITNESS: Yes, certainly. It violates the laws of harmony because the tones are in fifths and you are not supposed to write consecutive fifths.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: You mentioned earlier that the fees in the Montreal area are higher on account of their insurance scheme which is attached to it. Could you give any idea of the benefits of this scheme to the members?

The WITNESS: Yes. The Montreal local have in addition to their fees a tax which looks after their members when ill. There is a regular payment for sickness when they cannot work and a \$1,000 death benefit when they get their harp.

*By Mr. Carter:*

Q. When you make a contract, does your contract specify that you will be employed for so many hours?—A. Yes. It is a legal contract.

Q. For the whole year?—A. No. Most of our engagements are miscellaneous. In Toronto we do about \$3½ million.

Q. In the case of the C.B.C. it employs talent the year around and they would just have an individual contract with individual union locals?—A. Yes, for 13 weeks, 26 weeks, or up to 52. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to let this honourable committee know we do attempt to protect the interests of our members. For instance, there was a famous recording made. Its contents I will not comment on, only the music,—“The Investigator”. The music was all original. I would suggest that if you can buy that record that you do so for the music alone. It was written by Agostini and there were 28 men employed. In some manner a tape was made of that broadcast and as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation had only bought the Canadian rights we fought for them. I read in addition to the three Toronto papers the New York Times and I find that it has a great deal of Canadian news in it which is not ordinarily covered by our Canadian press. I saw that these records were selling, 15,000 one week and 48,000 another week, and I immediately telephoned New York to find out what was going to happen to this material and the transcription. We finally were able with the cooperation of the American Federation of Musicians to collect \$5,600 for the composer for his music and the 28 men who played. That money has been paid without any embarrassment to the C.B.C.

The CHAIRMAN: I see, gentlemen, that it is a quarter to one. I do not think you are finished with Mr. Murdoch. Would it be in order to sit this afternoon or shall we go on?

Mr. GOODE: I would like to ask the indulgence of the committee because I have some information to come from Mr. Murdoch. Also there are a couple of other questions I would like to do some research on and perhaps we could meet again.

Mr. FLEMING: The information Mr. Murdoch sent for could be put on the record, could it not?

Mr. GOODE: There are some other questions, if you would bear with me. I am not in a position to ask them until later.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee. Does the committee wish to have another meeting at 3.30 or will you keep on?

Mr. GOODE: I am also in the hands of the committee. I would like to ask these questions but I am not going to insist on it. It is in connection with the answers which Mr. Murdoch has given me regarding the R.C.A.F. My information is different. I do not want to argue on it because I am not sure of my ground. But I have been given this information and I would like to check it to make sure. I do not suggest for a moment that Mr. Murdoch is wrong but I would like to be sure.

Mr. FLEMING: Is not the R.C.A.F. the place to go to for your information? You have heard Mr. Murdoch's answer. I do not think Mr. Murdoch is going to modify his answer. If it is a matter of information I would think that the only place to go is somewhere else.

The WITNESS: I may say that the honourable Mr. Powers was the Minister for Air and he issued a statement which will be in our files which clarified the situation. It was also in the press pointing out the error of the allegation.

Mr. GOODE: I want to be very fair with you. This situation was brought to my attention only yesterday afternoon in a statement from a very responsible member of parliament which was entirely different from the answer given by you. With all respect to you I would like to look into it. It is not too important however and as Mr. Fleming stated I can find it out somewhere else.

Mr. FLEMING: We proceed in this committee on the basis of not trying to tie people down in the questions that are asked and the matter Mr. Goode is asking now is not pertaining directly to broadcasting or television.



The WITNESS: It was approximately 15 years ago.

Mr. FLEMING: I know what the answer of Mr. Murdoch is on the question and if I know Mr. Murdoch that is the answer he is going to stay with. I think that if the matter is to be pursued there is not much point in pursuing it at further meetings at which Mr. Murdoch is to be asked to be a witness.

Mr. GOODE: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Murdoch has given me a definite answer, no, and with that on the record I thought that perhaps the other side should be put on but as I say I will leave it.

*By Mr. Robichaud:*

Q. I had one more question. Could you tell us what is the full name of this association or branch known as AGVA?—A. The name is the American Guild of Variety Artists.

Q. Do you know if there was any musician out of work through disagreement with this association?—A. Of course, there always is.

Q. Last year?—A. Yes. They have removed approximately \$150,000. Every musician has lost money. Their administrative secretary was removed immediately afterward.

Q. Could you give us the total contribution received by your association in Canada in any year, the total contribution in fees paid by the members?—A. You could compute it. In the two larger locals, Montreal and Toronto, if you take the membership of Montreal you would multiply it by \$22 and in Toronto multiply it by a simpler arithmetic of \$10. I have the figures in answer to Mr. Goode's question. The private stations in 1954—by our records there are 40 of them—paid our members in sustaining broadcasts \$315,117.28; in commercial employment they paid \$210,913.89, or a total of \$526,031.17. That is split among 40 stations.

*By Mr. Reinke:*

Q. Do you have the figures of the C.B.C.?—A. Yes. These are approximate. Our data come from contracts of instrumental musicians and on behalf of that the C.B.C. would pay additional amounts for arranging and composing. We hope next year to be able to keep a very close record on that. The C.B.C. in 1954, according to the records, paid to our members \$1,417,253.94. I say that is an approximate figure because in addition to that there would be amounts for compositions and arranging.

*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. The private stations actually pay one third or an equivalent?—A. No.

Q. One fifth of the income of the musicians in Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. But you have said, Mr. Murdoch, that these private stations fight among themselves and I expect they fight with your union as everyone else does with other unions?—A. No.

Q. And they pay your people a half a million dollars a year?—A. Yes, but when they get their licence they give the Department of Transport certain guarantees that they will produce so much live talent. I am not complaining about the forty who paid our rates, but I am thinking about the other 153 who share our product and the C.B.C. facilities and do not spend a nickel.

Q. You have expressed the opinion that you do not welcome private television stations across Canada?—A. I have not said that.

Q. Would you welcome them?—A. I would certainly welcome them if they would give a guarantee on a contractual basis as to the employment they would give.

Q. You will agree with me that \$500,000 is a lot of money for private stations to pay to musicians in Canada?—A. I think it is a very small amount spread all over Canada.

Q. How much do you think it should be?—A. About five times that.

Q. More than the C.B.C.?—A. We would expect the C.B.C. to increase. I do not mind admitting that I am prejudiced. My job is to sell musicians.

Q. I think perhaps a job of selling could have been done to the other private stations by your union?—A. We have tried.

Mr. GOODE: Keep trying.

*By Mr. Richardson:*

Q. On page 2 of Mr. Murdoch's brief—I do not want to read anything in that should not be there—but I would like an explanation. He says:

Let me say here that the name American Federation of Musicians does not imply foreign or American control.

Why do you say that?—A. Because there has been a suggestion made and I have been the straw man so often that I think that I should make it perfectly clear to the committee that I can wave the "jack" or other emblem whichever is decided on, with a great deal of enthusiasm because I am a Canadian; my parents were born in this country. I just wanted to make it perfectly clear that every local has local autonomy. On June 6 when we meet at Cleveland nobody will know who are delegates until they arrive. They will bring their credentials and the Canadians have the same right to get up on the floor and make resolutions. As a matter of fact at one of our conventions one of our Canadian members said on an occasion "I think you are nuts". Somebody apologized for him and I said that I thought he had the perfect right if he thought in his opinion they were nuts to say they were nuts.

Q. Does the Board of Directors administer the affairs of the federation?—A. They administer the rules and regulations of the federation as enacted by the general body at a convention.

Q. Those rules and regulations of the general body enacted at a convention apply to all the union chapters?—A. Yes, in some aspects. There are certain things like motion pictures that are international. In that case, the convention will say to the International Executive Board will you negotiate a new agreement. We meet these people—and it involves \$29 or \$30 million—and make a trade agreement for five years. The same is true in the recording field which is international. We meet and decide on conditions. But when your daughter gets married and you want to have an orchestra play you go to the local union and they say we are delighted, here are the scales, and then you go and you employ them on your own. Outside of motion pictures and recordings and transcriptions, it is a matter of local autonomy. In Canada it is not a one man show. We invite our members from coast to coast in as advisors and we sit down and talk as reasonable men.

Q. You would say that by and large the general interests of Canadian musicians would not be affected much, if any, if they belonged to a chapter which had a Canadian charter rather than an American one?—A. No. Neither music nor business is organized that way. I suggest you read the financial critic in the Globe and Mail who has been pointing out how little Canadians have to do with the control with some of the larger corporations. Americans come here and we have to have some control when they come to us and they have control when we go to them.



*By Mr. Goode:*

Q. But it is a fact you can be out-voted four to one on that board?—

A. The Canadian executive think one Canadian is worth four Americans. I want to assure you there is not anything that is ever sent to the federation either from England, Australia or South Africa that Mr. Petrillo does not send to me for comment and usually tells us to make our own decisions.

Q. Is it not a fact, without being facetious, that you are out-voted four to one on the board?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Murdoch, for the very interesting brief and the very interesting answers which you have given to the committee.





## APPENDIX "A"

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS OF THE UNITED STATES  
AND CANADA

APPLICATION BLANK



# AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Local No. 149

## Application Blank

I, the undersigned, desire to become a member of TORONTO MUSICIANS' ASSOCIATION under Article III of the Constitution and By-Laws, and I do hereby promise and agree that if elected to membership I will faithfully and at all time support, conform to and be bound by the Constitution, By-Laws, Rules, Regulations and Tariff of Fees of said TORONTO MUSICIANS' ASSOCIATION, and of the American Federation of Musicians, as the same now exist and as they may be added to, altered, amended or repealed, at any time during which I may in future be a member, and I furthermore agree to forfeit my membership in this Local if it shall be proven that I have answered untruthfully any question contained in this application, and furthermore agree to forfeit all fees paid to the Local or American Federation of Musicians, as the case may be.

1. Name? .....  
(Professional Name) .....
2. When and where born? .....
3. Where do you reside? .....
4. How long have you resided there? .....
5. Where did you reside before entering this jurisdiction? .....
6. Why did you fail to apply for membership there? .....
7. What instrument or instruments do you play? .....
8. Are you a citizen of the United States? .....  
(Citizens of Dominion of Canada will so state) .....  
Final papers issued:  
When? ..... Where? ..... Number?.....
9. If "No" to Question No. 8, have you legally declared yourself to become a citizen of the United States?  
First papers issued:  
When? ..... Where? ..... Number? .....  
(a) Are you at present or been in the past a member of the Communist party? .....
- (b) Do you have any leaning toward the Communist party or assist this party by any action that might further the progress of this party knowingly?  
Answer yes or no .....
10. Are you a member of any branch of the armed forces of the United States or Canada? .....
11. Are you at present a member of any Musicians' Protective Organization in the United States or Canada? .....
12. Name it? .....
13. Have you ever been a member of any Musicians' Protective Organization in the United States or Canada, and if so, name it? .....
14. Have you ever made application for and been refused membership by a Local of the American Federation of Musicians, and if so, for what cause? .....
15. Have you ever been suspended, erased or expelled from a Musicians' Protective Organization in the United States or Canada? .....
16. When and where? .....
17. For what cause? .....
18. Have you ever rendered service at a place or with an organization on the National Unfair List? .....
19. If so, where and with whom? .....
20. Have you ever rendered service at a place on the Forbidden Territory List of the American Federation of Musicians? .....
21. If so where? .....
22. Do you work at any other trade or vocation? .....
23. If so, name it? .....
24. Is there a Union of that trade or vocation in this jurisdiction? .....
25. Are you a member of the Union of that trade or vocation in this jurisdiction?....
26. Have you ever been suspended, erased or expelled from any Union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or any other Labor Union? .....
27. If so, for what cause? .....
28. Have you been imported into this country by an agent, musical director, or employer? .....
29. Have you played any professional engagements during the time you were not a member of the Federation, and if so, where and with whom? .....
30. Have you been persuaded to come here under promise of engagements? If so, state who made such promises, and the conditions under which you were induced to come here? .....
31. Signature .....  
Social Security Number .....  
Residence .....  
Telephone Number .....  
Recommended by .....

*This application for Local membership will not be accepted from any prospective member until a complete answer on said blank has been made to No. 8 and/or No. 9 (this relating to citizenship status in the United States or Canada.)*

### BOND

The undersigned does hereby pledge himself as Surety for ..... a minor, until he has reached his majority, who promises to faithfully support the Constitution, By-Laws and Tariff of Fees of the T.M.A. and the provisions as enumerated in the above application, and that in case of any violation of the same, the undersigned will be responsible for all such charges brought, or fines imposed against said person.

Witnessed by ..... (Signed) ..... Surety.

This application was made on ..... 19 ..... Signed by .....  
Secretary of Local No. 149 of Toronto, Canada.